DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 203 236 CG 015 219

AUTHOR Pryor, Brandt W.: And Others
TITLE National Symposium on Children in Jail.
INSTITUTION Illinois Univ., Urbana.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquent Prevention (Dept. of Justice), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Aug 80
NOTE 197p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adolescents: *Change Strategies: *Child Advocacy: Children: *Correctional Institutions: *Delinquency: *Delinquent Rehabilitation: Program Descriptions: *Program Improvement: Public Support: State of the Art Reviews: State Programs: Youth Problems

ABSTRACT

These conference proceedings are designed to provide the latest research on children in jails and to assist in the development of action programs. The materials include a "work file" of alternatives to jail, such as a home detention program, short-term shelter care, crisis intervention services and foster care, because jail placements do not provide good child care and are only defensible when the public requires protection. Programs in various states are described, and methods of changing public policy and public education and monitoring facilities are detailed. State strategy sessions are also summarized. Special recognition is given to the contributions of the National Coalition on Jail Reform which calls for a complete and total prohibition of the jailing of juveniles. (JAC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED203236

CG015219

national symposium on children in jail

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Symposium Planning Committee

Rosemary Ahmann, Olmstead County Board of Commissioners
James W. Brown, Community Research Forum
Gail Funke, Institute for Economic and Policy Studies
M. Kay Harris, National Council on Crime and Delinquency
Donald R. Jensen, John Howard Association
Judith Johnson, National Coalition for Jail Reform
Roderick H. O'Connor, National Association of Counties
Brandt W. Pryor, Community Research Forum
Margaret Woods, National Council on Crime and Delinquency

Brandt W. Pryor
Symposium Coordinator

The National Symposium on Children in Adult Jails was co-sponsored by the National Coalition for Jail Reform and the Community Research Forum of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and supported by a grant from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the U.S. Department of Justice.

August, 1980

Foreword

Deinstitutionalization of juvenile offenders is at the heart of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. Nowhere is the need to deinstitutionalize more urgent than in our nation's county jails and municipal lockups. Recent research confirms the often stated but previously undocumented problems associated with the practice of jailing juveniles; strong and pervasive national support prohibiting jail confinement of juveniles has established an environment conducive to change; and the successful efforts at the state and local level provide clear direction for those communities interested in removing children from adult jails and lockups.

While removing children from adult jails and lockups is only part of the overall deinstitutionalization mandate of the JJDP Act, it is clearly the most grievous and chronic element in the longstanding pattern of institutional overkill in the United States. Dissolution of this practice will require imagination and perserverance at the local level as well as the continued support of all those participating in the National Symposium on Children in Jail.

Ira M. Schwartz
Administrator
Office of Juvenile Justice
and Delinquency Prevention

Contents

FOREWORD

1 INTRODUCTION
5 KEYNOTE ADDRESS
7 THE PROBLEM OF CHILDREN IN JAILS
13 ADVOCACY
17 MONITORING
27 PUBLIC EDUCATION
35 CHANGING POLICY AND PRACTICES
43 ALTERNATIVES TO JAIL
51 SECURE DETENTION
61 STATE STRATEGY SESSION
73 CLOSING REMARKS

77 RESOURCES
81 ROSTER OF PARTICIPANTS
99 BIBLIOGRAPHY

1 Introduction

We have all attended conferences whose ultimate outcomes seem to be little more than providing an excuse for the out-of-town travel of the participants. The National Symposium on Children in Jails was intended by its planners to have effects more far-reaching. They intended that participation in the Symposium should make a real and positive difference in the work of its participants, and in the lives of the children they serve.

This central concern of the Symposium's Planning Committee was expressed in four major objectives which guided the work of planning and implementation. The first was to "provide participants with the latest research about the problem of children in jails." The second was to "provide information about and access to successful alternatives to the practice of jailing children." The third was to "develop action programs, plans, and policies for the removal of children from jails, which could be implemented by the participants after the Symposium conclusion."

The final objective was to "generate public support for the removal of children from jails."

Research is an important aid in defining, clarifying and resolving problems in any field. Often, however, research findings do not reach practitioners in the field as soon as they should. Nor do practioners usually have an opportunity to question researchers and relate the new knowledge to their own situations, concerns and problems. The Symposium's first objective was to provide that opportunity for practitioners, as well as to make available the results of recently concluded, and often unpublished research. Researchers from universities, state agencies and other research institutions presented findings from research covering a wide range of issues concerning the problem of juveniles in adult jails. The presentations were followed by an opportunity for participants to question researchers and relate the findings to their individual concerns.

Linda Abram, of the Community Research Forum of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, presented findings which studied the policies and practices of the federal detention of youth, and which assessed their responsiveness to the objectives of the JJDP Act. Mark Ezell, of the Florida Center for Children and Youth, outlined the results of a comprehensive study of children in adult jails and the problems which exist concerning efforts to prohibit the practice in the State of Florida. Donna Hamparian, of the Academy for Contemporary Problems, described preliminary findings of her study concerning waiver of juvenile court jurisdiction. John Poulin, of the National Assessment Center for Alternatives to Juvenile Justice

Processing at the University of Chicago, provided findings concerning the number of children incarcerated in the 1970's. Kenneth Wooden, author of the widely acclaimed Weeping in the Playtime of Others, presented valuable insight into his investigative reporting of the juvenile justice system.

To end the practice of jailing juveniles, successful and feasible alternative practices be available to decision-makers. The Symposium's second objective was to give participants access to a wide range of such alternatives, so that they might select and adapt to local conditions those most appropriate. The Symposium "work-file" (given to each participant) contained much information on alternative programs, including abstracts developed by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, of a number of model alternatives. Further information was provided by over a dozen workshop presentors who spoke on alternative programs from rich and varied backgrounds in development, research and technical assistance.

Many conferences are effective in disseminating information, yet make no provision for its direct utilization in the field. The Symposium's third objective, the development of "action plans" was selected to aid participants in directly applying the knowledge they gained to their own situations at home. Afternoon "strategy sessions" led by facilitators, encouraged participants to develop plans of action for implementation in their own states. Varied attendance, differing problems and resources, and wide ranges of organizational maturity necessarily wrought great variation in the plans which were developed. This is as it should be, for this aspect of the Symposium especially belonged to the participants. It was theirs to do with as they pleased, their most salient opportunity to adapt the program to their needs and interests. It was perhaps this aspect of the program, more than any other, which kept the Symposium from being "just another conference." As Gail Funke said, "A conference with an outcome beyond the usual stacks of material - a 'revolutionary' idea, long overdue!" As Virginia Mackey put it, "This was a working Symposium which lived up to that expectation."

The Symposium's fourth objective was the generation of public support for resolution of the problem of children in jails. The problem is both a national, and a local one, and the Symposium dealt with this objective on both levels. On the national level, public interest and awareness were aroused through publicity on the Symposium itself. Barbara Sewell, of the Community Research Forum, and Jim Collier, of the Office of Public Affairs of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, carried out an unusually effective publicity campaign that brought representatives from the Colorado media, the Los Angeles Times, National Public Radio and CBS. Change, Rolling Stone and Newsweek magazines have requested information on the Symposium, as has the Secretary General of Interpol.

On the local level, the Symposium focused on helping participants educate the public in their own communities. The workshop on public education presented; 1) the most current and effective means to determine the information that should be given the public; 2) publicity as a means of educating the public; and 3) the use of advertising in public education. The Symposium "work-file" offered numerous public education resources, including a sample press release, and an annotated bibliography of public education references. The

effectiveness of the above for participants may be reflected in the fact that over a dozen 'action plans" specifically included "public education" as an objective.

In addition to achieving its four central objectives, the Symposium had some additional outcomes. Samuel Sublett mentioned that the "Symposium provided a good forum for idea exchange and development of policy consensus." Elizabeth Dreyfuss said, "The Symposium provided materials begging to be translated into understandable curriculum for schools and detention facilities." The information presented and ideas exchanged at the Symposium sparked valuable thoughts for future research, programming and action. Among them were:

> I'd like to see an entire conference focused on the alternatives [to jail], including nitty-gritty techniques of residential care and treatment.
>
> Roger Paine

> Future conferences might focus on the development of skills in team building and the development of coalitions.
>
> Clergue Jones

> One aspect of the...problem which has not received its share of attention is the issue of juveniles waived to the adult court system who are held... as adults prior to disposition.
>
> Sally Harner

All the outcomes of the Symposium were the result of over six months of hard work by more people than there is space here to mention. The OJJDP provided the majority of the financial support for the Symposium, but the participants themselves made it all possible. Without their attendance, participation, questioning, and involvement, none of this would have occurred. Was all this worthwhile? The latest research was reported to participants and they took advantage of their opportunity to question researchers, to probe beneath the obvious, and to relate this new knowledge to their own circumstances. Access was given to successful alternatives to jailing children. Reams of printed material, interpersonal exchanges of experience, and over a dozen workshop presentations offered almost a plethora of information. Participants from 41 states and several provinces of Canada developed action plans to implement upon their return home. Problems were defined and clarified, objectives determined and dates set for future meetings, as a result of the Symposium's strategy sessions. A strong publicity effort generated unusual amounts of press coverage, and reporting, while the public education materials gave participants the tools to continue the effort on their home fronts. Perhaps Terry Donahue said it best:

> Symposia such as this demonstrate that issues, problems and innovative programs can be presented in a manner which converts effective ideas into specific system change strategies.

2 Keynote Address

The Symposium on Children in Adult Jails was opened by Rosemary Ahmann, a County Commissioner from Minnesota who chairs the Criminal Justice Committee of the National Association of Counties. In her opening remarks, she reiterated the position of the National Coalition for Jail Reform calling for a complete and unequivocal prohibition on the jailing of juveniles. As a charter member of the Coalition, Commissioner Ahmann recognized several people seated at the head table who had worked closely with the group in formulating this strong national stance, including Roderick O'Connor, National Association of Counties; John Churchville, American Friends Service Committee; Ira Schwartz and David West of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention; Jim Brown of the Community Research Forum of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; Barbara Fruchter of the Juvenile Justice Center of Pennsylvania; Kay Harris of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency; and Don Jensen of the John Howard Association; and Anthony P. Travisono, of the American Correctional Association.

The keynote speaker for the National Symposium on Children in Jail--Ira M. Schwartz, Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention--was introduced by Don Jensen who noted Schwartz's long standing commitment to reform in the area of juvenile justice and delinquency prevention. Prior to his appointment to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Mr. Schwartz was Executive Director of the Washington Council on Crime and Delinquency, and before that of the John Howard Association.

In his keynote address, Mr. Schwartz reported that U.S. Deputy Attorney General Renfrew had proposed to Congress during the past week, that the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act be amended to prohibit the confinement of juveniles in adult jails and lockups, and to require complete removal within seven years as a condition of participation in the funding program of the Act. This amendment would replace the often abused "sight and sound" separation required under current legislation.

Schwartz cited the practice of jailing juveniles as the most grievous aspect of our Nation's long-standing pattern of over-institutionalization, noting that there are more than 500,000 juveniles confined in adult jails and lockups each year. He stated that the abuses cited by the Children's Defense Fund in Children in Adult Jails have been repeatedly confirmed by research since the enactment of the JJDP Act in 1974, and pledged the resources of his Office to eliminate the practice. He urged Symposium participants to enlist the involvement of all citizens in their home communities in this effort and asked them to recognize the imaginative and valuable contribution which young people can make toward resolving this unique problem indigenous to

their own age group. Further, he urged the establishment of specific and objective release/detention criteria and the development of alternatives to secure detention. Schwartz cautioned against over-zealous development of new juvenile residential facilities, citing research which documents the extremely high detention rate which exists in the nation, and the tendency of the court to detain even greater numbers of youth where separate juvenile detention centers are available.

Special note was made of the contribution of the National Coalition for Jail Reform, with Schwartz calling for the continuation of a strong, pervasive commitment by the member organizations to educating the public, and raising the level of citizen awareness of the issues surrounding the jailing of juveniles.

In closing, Schwartz cited the practicality of removing juveniles from adult jails and lockups, describing the accomplishments in Davenport, Iowa and in the State of Pennsylvania as examples. He wished the Symposium participants well in the development of state strategies during the three-day session and solicited continued support for the Congressional deliberations currently underway.

3 The Problem of Children in Jails

Don Rademacher
Community Research Forum
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

My comments are based on the Children's Defense Fund study, Children in Adult Jails. The information was obtained during on-site visits to 449 jails and lockups in nine states. The study is not new. The data will be augmented by findings obtained during the current verification review of detention practices and monitoring in 42 states and the District of Columbia being done for OJJDP.

First, a few general issues:

The United States has an excessive number of facilities in which people can be locked up. During the CDF study it was estimated that there were over 16,000 jails and lockups at the community level. We really do not know just how many there are. States are still finding lockups. Capacity in these facilities is also high, more than needed in many communities.

Children are locked in every conceivable secure facility.

Admission and release records in these facilities are limited and often do not exist in any usable form. While records have improved in some facilities, the inmate's name, age, offense, time and date admitted, and time and date released are hard to find in most.

While the CDF study was based on limited data, the data were collected on-site. This is important. Questionnaires will not do the job.

Some findings:

— Of the 449 jails visited, 38.1 percent held children regularly by policy.

-- Another 15 percent admitted they held children occasionally.

-- Children found their way into 53 percent of the jails and lockups. The percentage may be slightly lower today.

-- In the study, it was assumed that most of the children held in adult facilities would be held in county jails. Of the county jails, 59.2 percent held children.

-- It was assumed that city jails and lockups would hold few children. Only 29.2 percent of these facilities held children, but they held more than county jails annually.

-- It was assumed that counties with juvenile detention homes would rarely use adult facilities. Of the counties and independent cities visited, 55 percent had detention homes. In these jurisdictions, 83 jails and lockups held over 9,000 children during the study year.

-- On the day the facility was visited, 350 children were in adult facilities. Of the total, 93 had been waived to adult criminal jurisdiction.

-- 81.6 percent were boys--18.4 percent were girls.

-- Of the total, 43.4 percent were under age 15 and 9.2 percent were under 13. Of the girls held, 75.0 percent were under 15 and 12.5 percent were under 13. This is changing. Fewer girls are held today. Children in jails are a bit older.

-- Minority children are over-represented in the jail population. While most children held were white, 31.8 percent were minority children and 24.8 percent were black. Bias was noted in most communities.

-- Up to our day of visit, the average stay in these facilities was six days. 31.9 percent were held under 24 hours, but this is not comforting for this is the dangerous time period. Of all children held, 54.9 percent stayed less than 72 hours, but 37.8 percent stayed five days or longer. One Indiana boy, who had been committed to a mental health facility, had already been in jail over six months. The chief jailer sadly watched the child deteriorate.

We expected the offenses of the children to be serious. Most were not. They were:

Serious crimes against persons	11.7%
Property crimes	27.8%
Minor assaults	7.7%
Minor property offenses	5.8%
Behavior acts	12.3%
Status offenses	17.9%
Protective offenses--non-offenses	4.3%
Awaiting transfer--offense unknown	15.5%

All too often the offense was unknown.

It was mentioned that 93 of the children held had been waived. These children are placed in the general population. The number of children waived seems to be increasing. A waived boy in Seminole County, Florida waited 211 days for a trial on purse-snatching. When his case was again continued on the 212th day, he set fire to the jail, killing himself and ten other inmates.

Most state laws require the separation of adults and children in adult secure facilities. We found that 35.9 percent of these facilities provided substantial separation, 42.3 percent provided some separation, and 21.8 percent provided no separation. This is improving, but is still a problem in most states.

How many children are held in jails and lockups? No one knows for sure. In Corrections in the United States, the National Council on Crime and Delinquency's study for the President's Crime Commission, it was reported that 85,951 children were held in jails. If children held in lockups were included the estimate was 100,000. In Under Lock and Key, Dr. Rosemary Sarri said that 500,000 children were held in jails and lockups.

Our unpublished conservative estimate made during the Children in Adult Jails study placed the number over 600,000. At the time, there may have been over a million held annually. The number is probably down today, but it is still way too high.

The effect of adult detention on children is not documented. Suicide data show the rate is higher than for juvenile detention homes. Rape and general child abuse do occur regularly. Criminal education is advanced. The solution is available. Close adult jails and lockups to all children.

John J. Buckley, Sheriff
Middlesex County, Massachusetts

Massachusetts underwent extraordinary reform a decade ago and essentially ended the practice within the state of jailing children in adult facilities. The reform effort also broke the system of centralized training school which the state maintained. In its place, the newly-created Department of Youth Services (DYS) sought to establish small, community-based programs which were less restrictive and more focused on treatment than detention.

The experience of Massachusetts reform taught us lessons we had not anticipated. First, we learned that reforming the old system proved far more difficult than anticipated because of staff resistance and after two years of trying, the new DYS Commissioner, Jerome Miller, closed it down entirely. At about the same time, as sheriff, I sued myself in order to get the 50 or so children then in my custody out of our adult facilities under the same state law creating the Department of Youth Services. In a short time, there were no children in any jail in the state.

Taking the children out of jail and closing the old training school system was only a preliminary step. It took several more years to create a new system. The original plans were not quite in place when the schools were closed, placing a rather creative strain on both regional DYS staff and community programs. After the majority of youth were placed, it took even more time to develop the capacity to effectively evaluate them and support those which were working well. Now that consolidation has taken place and some stability has returned to the system, much of the controversy is focused on the nature of secure detention: children in jail having come full circle.

One problem existing throughout the reform effort was due to the inability of DYS to control the entire process. Other actors in the system have tried to evade it by holding children in secure detention before they were heard in court and turned over to DYS, or by having them bound over to stand trial as adults. But that was only part of the problem. The larger issue has to do with the perceived need for secure facilities for some children, although there is considerable debate about whether it is a real need of the children or a political perception. There is some evidence to suggest that those held in secure detention (however arbitrarily) before their case is heard in court stand a greater chance of being sent to a secure facility by DYS later.

The initial reaction was to do away with as many secure facilities as possible. This was followed by the realization that some kids would run, and when they were unable to run, they took out their hostility on the staff which was sufficiently trained to handle it. This led in turn to staff

training, and eventually to clinical professionals charged with secure treatment in facilities that were not to house more than 15 children at a time.

The issue of security appears to hinge on several factors: real need, or at least the needs perceived by the institutions' professionals; and political perceptions having to do with questions of fear and distrust, both of which appear to be on the rise in America today. Although Massachusetts is ahead of most states in getting kids out of jail, reform seems to be cyclical and we may be moving into a conservative phase. The fear, distrust, and general alienation we hear so much about today may make serious inroads into our progress.

Kenneth Wooden
National Coalition for Children's Justice

Ken Wooden speaks of a forgotten and abused segment of our society--the children who are in lockups or lost to the streets. Failed by their parents, their schools, their churches and their communities, these youngsters are hapless victims of economic, political and sexual exploitation. Come and learn about the last frontier of human rights; children and institutional suicides, the interstate commerce of kids, child prostitution and pornography and the non-readers who are placed in residential treatment centers at $15,000 to $50,000 per child per year. Discover the scams costing taxpayers billions of dollars and denying our young the chance for a decent and full life where they may develop their own unique potential. Wooden, who has collected poetry of these forgotten youngsters, interweaves their prose with his investigative reporting. This issue is documented in Wooden's best-selling book, Weeping in the Playtime of Others.

Margaret L. Woods
National Council on Crime and Delinquency

When dealing with the subject of alternatives to jailing or institutionalizing children, only cursory attention is given to the needs of poor and minority children.

It is almost axiomatic that institutional populations are almost entirely minority and poor (80-90 percent) and alternative programs are mainly for white, middle and upper class youth. Yet, studies have shown that middle and upper class and white youth commit as many crimes as poor children and that place of residence and race are not significant determinants of degree of youthful, criminal activity.

The words "racism" and "classism" are frequently considered taboo, but to avoid their use is to duck the issue. They are the two major reasons minority and poor youth are disproportionately represented in institutional populations. Racism and classism infect all aspects of our society, and they are not going to be eliminated in the near future. However, if we are serious about

ending the differential treatment of children these two basic ills of American society must be frontally assaulted.

Both formal and informal court criteria for detention are weighted against minority and poor youth. They typically include income level, parental education level, parental employment status, location of residence, and length of stay in the community. All of these criteria can, and usually do, operate against minorities and the poor.

Alternative programs often have a white, middle class orientation. The operators are either unwilling or unable to take into consideration the positive aspects of cultures other than their own. For example, rather than seeing "street culture" and the extended family as strengths they view them as inherently criminogenic. This causes alternative programs either to not accept minority and poor youth or to make unfair and unrealistic demands on these youngsters, virtually assuring that they will "fail."

But programs such as the House of Umoja in Philadelphia, New Pride in Denver, and the Neighborhood Youth Diversion Project in New York City prove that alternative programming for minority and poor youth can work.

There are ways to ensure that all youth receive fair and equitable treatment within the juvenile justice system. Court detention practices must be strictly monitored, and financial sanctions applied where flagrantly discriminatory practices are found. Alternative program admission practices must also be strictly monitored, and the same fiscal sanctions applied.
Minority and poor communities must be empowered to share the responsibility of helping their children. They must be helped to: 1) participate in monitoring of both the courts and alternative programs; 2) advocate for programs within their communities which have staff representative of the community; and 3) advocate for nontraditional minority and community groups to become service providers.

The elimination of racist and classist practices in the juvenile justice system is not, however, solely the responsibility of poor and minority groups. For these efforts to succeed requires the participation of all segments of the community, working together.

John E. Poulin
National Center for the Assessment of Alternatives to Juvenile Justice Processing
University of Chicago

Findings from a recently completed study--Juveniles in Detention Centers and Adult Jails: An Analysis of State Variations During the Mid-1970's--showed extreme variation among the states in the use of detention centers and adult jails for juvenile offenders. Rates of admissions to both types of facilities varied one hundredfold. Correlational and regression analyses revealed that the practices of detaining juveniles in centers and jails are unrelated and that they form distinct patterns in relation to other factors. Detaining juveniles in centers is primarily an urban phenomenon strongly related to referral to court. Holding juveniles in jails is a rural practice unrelated to court activity but strongly associated with police contact.

These findings suggest the need for the development of differing strategies or types of programs if the goals of reducing the use of detention centers and eliminating the practice of holding juveniles in adult jails are to be realized.

James W. Brown
Community Research Forum
University of Illinois at Urbana

The issue of children in adult jails and lockups is complex and shrouded in a cloak of long-standing myth and misconception. Research and technical assistance sponsored by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention during the past five years has provided clarity to the issue and developed promising strategies and programs to accomplish the Congressional mandate of deinstitutionalization of juvenile offenders. While there has been little change in the abysmal conditions described by the Children's Defense Fund in their pioneering study of Children in Adult Jails, the problem has crystalized and the future direction clearly established.

National scope research has documented the national preoccupation with institutionalization in the handling of juvenile offenders and the overwhelming prevelance in the case of misbehaving girls and minority youth. Under the guise of "teaching them a lesson" and "getting their attention" our Nation has countenanced institutional abuse far worse than the child abuse, we so fervently denounce. Given the well-documented abuses and grim conditions of the majority of our jails and lockups, consider the following facts:

- -Less than 25% of those juveniles jailed are charged with serious offenses.
- -20% are jailed on status offenses which would not be a crime if committed by an adult.
- -4% of those jailed have not been charged with any offense at all.
- -Over 50% of those juveniles jailed could be released with no increased danger to the public safety or court process.
- -The suicide rate of children in adult jails is 7 times greater than those detained in separate juvenile facilities or the general youth population.

While most states require sight and sound separation of juveniles and adult offenders, the laws are loosely construed by state, local and federal officials and poorly enforced in the name of administrative expediency and convenience. Juveniles are often isolated by jail officials in the drunk tank or isolation cell under the guise of separation. Ironically, the juvenile justice system which 81 years ago sought to take wayward youth under their wing as a "substitute parent" has relegated them, in many instances, to the most abysmal conditions in America. The pool from which many jails claim their inmates is the estimated 755,000 runaways, many of whom are not seeking the nostalgic Tom Sawyer adventure, but are fleeing emotional, physical and sexual abuse. Actions by governmental agencies and national organizations are important catalysts for change in the plight of these youth. The problem is pervasive, however, and found in every nook and cranny of our country. Elimination of the practice of jailing juveniles can only be achieved by an informed and concerned citizenry which will address the issue face-to-face with local officials in their own community. The state-of-the-art is such that rapid progress can be made in this area with effective youth advocacy at the local level.

4 Advocacy

Reverend Virginia Mackey
National Interreligious Task Force on Criminal Justice

In the cause of children in jails, advocacy is a difficult but a necessary task. It would be hard to imagine any group less able to be advocates in their own behalf; hard to imagine any group with less power and voice than the half-million children who, each year, are in our nation's jails.

So, advocacy is necessary. But the tendency to see ourselves as "Child Savers," in Anthony Platt's words, is acute. It is particularly easy to be parentalistic about what is best for problem children. When we are parentalistic and when we become too zealous, we ignore the very real people for whom we are trying to speak and act.

There is a paradox about advocacy for children. Most Americans have a soft spot in their hearts for children, but at the same time, they firmly believe that because they are minors in the technical sense they do not possess human and civil rights.

As advocates we need to keep in mind that paradox and beware the Child Savers image, lest the reforms we seek turn into another monster. The object lesson supreme of reform gone wrong: the establishment of the American penitentiary. The problem we face in getting children out of adult jails is that we dare not let them be detained for longer periods of time in juvenile secure detention facilities or let them be placed in inappropriate programs.

Over the years some principles of advocacy have emerged for me--sometimes out of common sense, sometimes out of bitter experience:

(1) An advocate should be an ally, not a helper. An ally is supportive, not charitable. An ally lets the person define his or her own needs. An ally works to empower persons to articulate and to deal with the problems they face. (See Instead of Prisons, p. 173.)

(2) An advocate needs to keep a sense of urgency--which is somewhat different than a sense of zeal. Urgency is anger about injustice tempered with a resolve to effect the change. That sense of urgency is best maintained by staying in touch and working side-by-side with the people who are suffering; it cannot be maintained in isolation. In this case, it is necessary for advocates to stay in touch with the children in jail and with their families.

3) An advocate is one who does homework; one who is in for the long pull; one who knows more about the problem than most of the people who have responsibility for it. When you are prepared, people are willing to listen and willing, eventually, to act.

(4) An advocate is one who knows how to ask questions. In one of his poems, T. S. Eliot said that the role of "the Messiah" is to "be the one who knows how to ask the right questions"--to be prepared to challenge any tradition, any power or any so-called authority in the cause of justice.

Over the past ten years, I have been involved in ecumenically-sponsored, citizen-based systemic change efforts at the local, state, and national level. From that experience, I would cite four activities and resources which could be shared with those of you who are organizing for change:

(1) A paper on "Coalition Building" presented at the first meeting of the National Jail Coalition.

(2) The New York State Coalition on Criminal Justice, which is an amalgam of direct service groups, prisoners, and advocates working with legislators and public policy makers.

(3) Prison Research Education Action Project (PREAP) materials produced by the New York State Council of Churches. They include a manual, Instead of Prisons, workshop formats and a slide show "Alternatives for a Safer Society: New Responses to Crimes and Victims."

(4) Our project on Alternatives to Jails, funded by Edna McConnell Clark Foundation in which we are organizing in two counties in New York State.

John E. Churchville
American Friends Service Committee

What does it mean to advocate the removal of children from jails? And, what are the ramifications of such an advocacy?

Perhaps I should delineate first what this advocacy does not and ought not mean.

1. It does not and ought not mean that we are seeking a euphemistic non-solution to the problem of children in jails by having them removed to reform schools, detention centers, youth study centers, or any other form of minimum to maximum security holding facility.

2. It does not and ought not mean that we ignore the role that the system of public education plays--particularly as it impacts upon Black, Hispanic, and Native American children--in failing to provide quality education and in feeding these children into the criminal justice system in ever-increasing numbers.

3. It does not and ought not mean that we accept America's economic system as it presently exists, without challenging it to provide meaningful work at an adequate wage for all our young people.

On the contrary, advocating the removal of children from jails does and ought to mean that we are committing ourselves to finding humane alternatives to incarcerating our young people, and to looking upon them not as statistical nuisances, but as human beings having inestimable

value.

Advocating the removal of children from jails does and ought to mean that we are preparing ourselves to confront those societal institutions that are responsible for meeting the educational, social, and personal needs of our young people, but are failing to do so.

And, finally, advocating the removal of children from jails does and ought to mean that we are strengthening ourselves to tackle the economic and social inequities which lie at the root of this problem.

The ramifications of such an advocacy lead us to wage a nonviolent peace offensive against the systems and institutions within our society which suppress and limit the full potential for development inherent in all our young people.

The ramifications of such an advocacy call us to transform our society.

Thomas V. Benjamin
Citizen Advocacy Network/New Jersey
National Council on Crime and Delinquency

Advocacy efforts on the behalf of young people have been hampered by public apathy to social reform, and by the enormous commitment of time and energy required to bring about positive change in the complicated child welfare field.

The media have distorted both the scope and the shape of the problem of children in conflict with the law and have thus contributed to a "new negativism." The public, while very concerned about youth crime, remains largely unaware of the juvenile justice system's inability to address the needs of children in a manner that is just, equitable, and humane. Advocacy groups are overburdened and understaffed, resulting in a high level of burn-out among the active participants. To be effective these organizations must be constantly revitalized with the on-going recruitment and training of "new blood."

To develop broadbased constituencies of youth advocates requires the combination of a variety of disciplines. Those interested in coalition building can learn much from the community organization techniques of activist groups working toward social reform over the past two decades. Strategy for Change: The Juvenile Justice System will review some of these basic community organization tactics with an eye to how they might best be used by individuals and groups fighting for children's rights.

Jeanne Block
Kentucky Youth Advocates, Inc.

Introduction

Kentucky Youth Advocates is a private non-profit organization which was established by a group of private citizens and juvenile justice professionals who are concerned about the plight of children

and youth involved in Kentucky's juvenile justice system. KYA has been funded on a "shoe string" budget of 60 percent private and 40 percent public monies since we opened our doors in November, 1977.

The staff consists of two full-time paid professionals and by graduate students who complete their field placement requirements at KYA. Since we are a citizens lobby for children, our Board of Directors is also very active and involved in our work. The backbone of the Board of Directors is the Junior League of Louisville and the National Council of Jewish Women: Louisville Section.

KYA is a class advocacy organization and so we work to change the policies, practices, procedures, and legislation that adversely affect children and youth who become involved in the juvenile justice system.

We are working to improve the judicial and social services provided to children and youth in Kentucky by: 1) conducting research studies in specific local juvenile justice issues, 2) developing legislation and lobbying, 3) negotiating with the state social service agency, 4) providing supportive services to lawsuits filed on behalf of children, and 5) community education.

KYA's Response to the Problem of Juveniles in Adult Jails

Kentucky Youth Advocate's presentation at the Symposium discusses the strategies which we are using to remove the nearly 10,000 juveniles per year who continue to be held in Kentucky's jails in violation of the deinstitutionalization and separation mandates of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDPA). These strategies include:

(1) KYA's unique contract with the state advisory group (SAG) to provide information to empower them to become a more vital force in determining policy for the youth of the Commonwealth. During the last two years, the advisory group has become an aggressive advocate which regularly follows KYA's recommendations by adopting progressive policies designed to accomplish the goals of the JJDPA;

(2) In conjunction with the state advisory group and a gubernatorially appointed task force, KYA drafted legislation which prohibits the detention of status offenders in county jails. This legislation is part of a complete juvenile code which has passed the Kentucky Senate and is being considered by the House of Representatives this week;

(3) KYA's successful efforts at assisting in the development of citizen advocacy groups in three separate counties in Kentucky who are petitioning their local governments for more humane secure and nonsecure detention services;

(4) KYA's on-site monitoring of random county jails; and

(5) KYA's current attempts to organize a "Children in Jails" Task Force which will be composed of decision-makers from all state agencies who have influence over the incarceration of juveniles in adult jails.

5 Monitoring

Doyle Wood
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

When Congress enacted the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention in 1974, they incorporated three major requirements which states must undertake to receive formula awards. These three requirements are (1) the deinstitutionalization of status offenders and nonoffenders from juvenile detention or correctional facilities; (2) the removal of juveniles from adult jails, lockups, and correctional facilities where regular sight and sound contact occurs between juvenile and adult offenders; and (3) an adequate monitoring system to insure both deinstitutionalization and separation occur. Congress also created a state advisory group and provides that such group may be given a role in monitoring state compliance with the JJDP Act requirements.

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention has developed many tools to assist states in their monitoring efforts. Each state has developed a specific monitoring plan and is implementing such plan. The Criminal Justice Council in each state can be contacted to find out how your state is undertaking the task of monitoring jails, detention facilities, correctional facilities and nonsecure facilities. The Office of Juvenile Justice and the Community Research Forum has developed a Monitoring Policy and Practices Manual which is available to those people involved with monitoring for compliance with the JJDP Act. This manual is intended to aid in a consistent and methodical development and implementation of an accurate, complete system of monitoring compliance to Section 223(a)(12) and (13) of the Act.

Many options exist for the development of an adequate system of monitoring jails, lockups and juvenile residential facilities as required by the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. While the components which make up the system are generally the same, the type of information will vary according to the needs of the individual state. This ranges from states concerned simply with monitoring compliance with the requirements of the Act, to those who are interested in the broader aspects of the monitoring effort.

Any monitoring system for a state should include:

- a formal, consistent, and continuous collection of data from law enforcement, courts, the agency responsible for placement of a juvenile, and the facilities which have been used for the placement of juvenile offenders;

- a means of continuing education for youth, the public, court personnel, lawyers, and law enforcement officers, concerning the JJDP Act and its implications, and mechanisms established within the state to insure the enforcement of the Act;

-- one or several monitoring devices which assures comprehensive coverage of all residential facilities in which juveniles are placed by the court for an offense, as well as those agencies responsible for the placement of these youth (police, courts, social services). Coverage should include periodic visits to each facility as well as unplanned spot checks and interviews with youth, family, and staff;

-- to facilitate objectivity in the process, at least one component of the monitoring system should be independent of the state and the agency responsible for the placement;

-- the process should provide assurances with respect to the privacy of those youth whose placement is being monitored;

-- there should be the provision of adequate funds to be used exclusively for monitoring activities; and

-- a process for the reporting and investigation of official and unofficial complaints concerning violations.

The juvenile residential facilities to be monitored and those agencies who are responsible for placement should collectively provide the following:

-- relevant data and information upon request of the monitoring agency;

-- accessibility to facilities, files and records, and staff;

-- list of the facilities used in the past for the placement of juveniles;

-- detailed plans for:

- the education of all employees concerning the Act and how it will be implemented;
- the identification of existing or planned nonresidential alternatives;
- the criteria and process utilized in placement of juveniles;
- dissemination of information regarding the Act and its implementation. This should include a written report with the name and number of the person or agency responsible for investigating violations; and
- a description of how the facility or agency conducts internal self-monitoring of its practices and procedures.

All monitoring agencies should be assured of:

-- access to all information regarding juveniles in residential facilities;

-- a regular and official means to report their findings (i.e., inclusion on monthly agendas, requirements of written reports to the legislature, Governor, juvenile corrections agency, court, and OJJDP): and

-- a means of soliciting and ensuring the privacy of reports of violations.

Several options have been recommended by national standards commissions and various states which

are currently in use across the country. The options which I am about to present are normally components of a monitoring system and several may be coupled together to establish a comprehensive monitoring strategy and become a basis for the development of a monitoring system.

-- State Commission on Juvenile Advocacy
-- State Advocacy Agency
-- Community Advisory Council
-- Monitoring Board
-- Defense Counsel
-- Legal Advocate
-- Lawyer's Committee
-- Legislative Committee
-- Independent Research
-- Grievance Mechanisms
-- Ombudsman
-- Arbitrator
-- Self-monitoring
-- Interim Monitoring Commission
-- Citizen Advocacy Groups
-- Special Intake Unit
-- Court Monitoring
-- Court Liaison
-- Court Watchers
-- Citizen Monitors
-- Centralized Complaint Office
-- Volunteer Advocates

(NOTE: A brief description of three to four of the options was presented orally and a handout describing each option was distributed.)

Monitoring can and should be used for multi-purposes. These purposes include determining compliance with state codes and legislations, state standards, policy, court orders, Federal legislation as well as monitoring for quality of service and care. A good monitoring system is actually a comprehensive juvenile justice information system which provides feedback on the processing of juveniles from apprehension, intake, detention, diversion, adjudication, disposition, placement, release follow-up, etc.

Monitoring is the first step and logically the easiest part in improving the system. A good monitoring system identifies what is happening, the problems, the level of compliance with various statutes, standards or requirements, and the quality of care. Although, in simplistic terms establishing and conducting a viable monitoring system is logically and relatively easy, it often meets much resistance because it shows what is occuring within the system. Many people do not want others to know what is actually happening.

Monitoring is viewed as an initial step because after the monitoring system is operational it shows what is occuring--the next step is to assess the situation, then develop and implement strategies to promote change and improve the services provided to the juveniles. This is the hard part.

As stated previously during this Symposium, the passing of legislation does not in and of itself solve the problems. Legislation alone is not the answer to improving the system. In fact, many states have legislation which requires or supports the removal of juveniles from jail--but the legislation is not being implemented. An effective monitoring system must accompany any legislation to determine the extent of compliance, to determine the effectiveness and efficiency of the legislation, and to determine if or how legislation should be modified.

Jim Oleson
Oleson-Ratliff Research Associates
Denver, Colorado

The utilization of citizens in monitoring institutions for youth has the potential to be a positive force for change, not only in solving problems related to these institutions, but pushing for standards of excellence.

This is an area where individual citizens and child advocacy groups can perform a meaningful and valuable service. The state of the art in using citizens in this function appears to be in its infancy. Some general guidelines may be introduced to provide direction to interested citizens or groups.

A working definition of monitoring is "a process of review to determine a condition or status." For citizens, it must go further; their efforts should include a plan of action that: collects information, gains knowledge from that information, and acts on the knowledge gained.

Citizens have the right to monitor. They also have the responsibility to do it well. This responsibility includes:

(1) Have a goal. It has to be specific. Example: monitoring a jail--for what reason? Quality of care, sight and sound separation, etc. Know what you are going to do with the information.

(2) Orientation. Find someone who can orientate you to the facility. Know the key functions of the program. Be familiar with procedures and process.

It is not important to know everything; be comfortable with your lack of expertise.

(3) Training. It is important to get training on how to be a monitor. Learn how to be comfortable and confident; assume no one wants you there; learn how to deal with typical responses; manipulation, resistance, patronization, avoidance.
Be aware of how you feel--inadequate, overwhelmed, scared. Share these feelings and develop a support system. Identify your own biases; learn how to be objective.

(4) Structure and methodology--Everyone needs to have a role; it needs to be clearly defined; all citizens need to know and be comfortable with what they are doing, all the time.

An example of one methodology was introduced. It includes a four-part process:

A) Programmatical standards. All programs and or facilities have certain expectations or elements that are necessary for them to do their work: licensing requirements, professional standards, statutory mandates. Use these standards or elements as your guide. Use these as a standard to measure the program against. Be knowledgeable of them and have them available for easy reference. (Many times standards are not adequate; get help to develop some.)

B) Documentation. All programs should have written policies and procedures that define and describe what they do. Compare these documents to the standards, identify the deficiencies.

C) Verification. Do not accept documentation as fact. Many programs have good paper, but the policies and practices are not followed in reality. Interview the key people involved, including youth. Are they aware of the policies; are they followed? Prepare questions that get accurate answers.

D) Take action. Know what you are getting information for. Act on the information and get results from your efforts.

The methodology was illustrated by examples from a recent effort by Colorado citizens in monitoring four residential treatment facilities for emotionally disturbed youth.

Mark Ezell
Florida Center for Children and Youth

The Children in Jails Project of the Florida Center for Children and Youth was undertaken to examine the children in jails issue here in Florida. A comprehensive survey of Florida's 211 county and municipal jails and lockups was designed to determine the state's ability to comply with federal guidelines and state law pertaining to the jailing of children. The jails in the survey ranged in capacity from one bed to several hundred beds. The data was collected over a three month period. The survey consisted of the following three components:

(1) Telephone Interviews: Jail officials at all 211 jails were interviewed concerning the incidence of juvenile confinement and the procedures used to assure separation. Of the 211 jails (a) 186 jails were classified as temporary holding facilities for the purpose of fingerprinting, photographing, questioning and pick-up of juveniles; 179 jailers indicated that juveniles had been temporarily held at their facilities in the three months prior to contact; (b) 104 jails were classified as detention facilities that may hold juveniles for more than 24 hours; 49 of these jailers reported that juveniles had been detained at their facilities in the three months prior to contact.

(2) Personal Interviews and Site Visits: Extensive interviews of the jail officials and a brief tour were conducted at facilities that had held juveniles for over 24 hours in the three months prior to contact. Information was gathered on the incidence of juvenile confinement in adult jails, separation procedures, and staffing and supervision arrangments.

(3) Interviews of Children: Children who had previously been held in an adult jails were interviewed concerning their jail experience.

In order to examine Florida's compliance with these federal guidelines, jail administrators were asked if they temporarily held juveniles at their facility. Temporary holding refers to the period of time when fingerprinting, photographing, questioning or waiting for pick-up occurs. Jailers at 179 facilities indicated that juveniles were temporarily held at their facilities, usually at an officer's desk, in an admitting area or in a questioning or waiting room, but some did use holding or regular cells. All but 26 of these

facilities were able to insure that juveniles had no regular contact with adult inmates during this period. Separation was usually maintained by using different areas of the jail or through time-phasing procedures. Officials from these 26 non-compliant jails estimated that 856 juveniles had been temporarily held at their facility during the three months prior to the telephone interview. On an annual basis, therefore, it may be estimated that several thousand juveniles were temporarily held under conditions that were inconsistent with the separation requirements of the federal guidelines.

During the three month period surveyed, the study identified 55 jails that had housed juveniles who were awaiting their trial. Of this number, 29 jails had housed juveniles who were under juvenile court jurisdiction, and therefore, subject to the federal guidelines. In situations where a juvenile is being held in jail for over 24 hours, guidelines specifically require that sight and sound separation from adults be maintained during admissions, sleeping, eating, showering, recreation, education, health care and transportation. Furthermore, contact between juveniles and adult inmate trustees is prohibited during all activities. Only one of the 29 jails in question--Manatee County Jail's female section--could provide the level of separation required by the federal guidelines.

In order to develop a profile of children in adult jails, data were collected on the 185 juveniles that had been incarcerated on the day of the site visits. The vast majority of juveniles found in adult jails were male; only two percent were female. There was an equal distribution of blacks and whites. Given the racial distribution of Florida's juvenile population as well as the distribution of juvenile arrests, this indicates an over-representation of blacks being held in adult jails. The juveniles tended to be older adolescents with 51 percent being 17 years of age and 32 percent being 16 years of age. Of the remaining juveniles, 13 percent were 15 and two percent wer 14 years of age. With respect to the offenses for which these juveniles were charged, 38 percent were felonies against persons, 41 percent were felonies against property, three percent were victimless felonies and six percent were either misdemeanors or violations of probation. In 11 percent of the cases, the jailers indicated that they did not know the charges against the juvenile.

Current laws are maintaining the flow of children into inadequate, overcrowded adult jails. The millions of dollars which would be necessary to construct new juvenile sections in all non-compliant facilities would be a poor investment of county, city and state resources. Attempts to administratively or procedurally cut off the flow of juveniles into these facilities or to seek improvements county by county would only amount to a piece-meal solution which has already proven to be ineffective.

Consequently, the most practical solution which takes into account the rights of the child and the protection of the public without requiring a substantial expenditure of resources, is the removal of children from adult jails. Juveniles who are accused of crimes and require secure confinement pending their court appearance, can be held at one of the 20 regional juvenile detention facilities.

Recommendations for a solution to the problem of children in jails are as follows:

(1) No person under the age of 18 who is under juvenile court jurisdiction shall be held or confined in an adult jail. This prohibition shall also include the time period in which a juvenile is being fingerprinted and photographed. Furthermore, no person under the age of 18 who is under adult court jurisdiction shall be confined in an adult jail until that person has been sentenced by the adult court to receive adult sanctions.

(2) Florida statutes and DHRS policy relating to admission to detention should be improved in order to reduce overcrowding in juvenile detention facilities. Furthermore, courts should assure that cases are expeditiously processed according to the statutory time limits, and that unreasonable delays and continuances are eliminated.

(3) New and effective monitoring and enforcement procedures for the above two recommendations should be created and funded by the Legislature.

The goal of keeping children out of jail is one that will require the cooperation of law enforcement, the courts, city and county governments, public defenders, state attorneys, state agencies and the Legislature. This goal should be Florida's highest priority and the first step toward the long overdue reform of all jails.

Jeanette Musengo
Illinois Prisons and Jails Project
John Howard Association

Meaningful change in the criminal justice system or in corrections requires the active involvement of average citizens. Leaving all of the policy decisions in these important areas to the "experts" in the field is an abdication of the responsibility that all citizens have for the social institutions created on their behalf to deal with various social ills. Direct access to prisons and jails breaks down the stereotypes and gives an understanding of the relative costs in human terms as well as in dollars of institutionalization and community alternatives. An independent, volunteer citizen observer plays a unique role as a third party presence and voice in interpreting the problems and needs to the public, the legislature, and the courts.

Though initially wary, somewhat threatened and defensive, corrections professionals in Illinois have recognized the value to them of receiving objective feedback and of having a supportive constituency for progressive programs.

Through a negotiated agreement with the Governor and the Director of the Department of Corrections, and with the Sheriff on the local level, Illinois Prisons and Jails Project, a part of the John Howard Association, recruits and trains volunteer committees who make regularly scheduled visitations to adult and juvenile institutions. These inspectional committes have uninhibited access to interview inmates and staff in the living units or on their assignments, inquiring into the living conditions, food service, work opportunities, educa-

tional programs, medical care, discipline, staff training, and management. After debriefing with administrators at the end of the day, a written report of the visitation goes initially to the institution and department officials, and subsequently out to the public.

IPJP/JHA's monitoring role is a departure from the many church and community-based groups who perform service functions or relate on a one-to-one basis to prisoners who need assistance during their incarceration and/or re-integration into free society after release. Rather, the project focuses on the policies and procedures which affect the well-being of all prisoners, and tries to assure decent and humane treatment, as well as an opportunity for constructive activity.

Through dissemination of the committee's objective findings, by means of the published reports, radio and TV talk shows, workshops and seminars on criminal justice issues, and outreach to community groups, IPJP is attempting to raise the public consciousness and to increase public awareness of the need for new approaches in addressing the problem of crime, in particular to encourage the use of alternatives to incarceration.

Joseph DeJames
Juvenile Detention and Monitoring Unit
New Jersey Department of Corrections

The Juvenile Detention and Monitoring Unit in the New Jersey Department of Corrections has two primary responsibilities--monitoring New Jersey's complaince with the federal JJDP Act and approving all juvenile detention facilities in New Jersey.

In regard to the monitoring function, the unit makes on-site visits and reviews admissions to all county jails in the State, to ensure that juveniles are not placed in jails. In regard to the evaluation and approval of juvenile detention facilities, the unit utilizes the New Jersey Department of Corrections' Manual of Standards for Juvenile Detention Facilities, which was written by staff of the unit.

It should be noted that New Jersey law prohibits the placement of juveniles in county jails and our monitoring efforts reveal that very few juveniles are illegally detained in adult county jails. As such, the presentation mainly focused upon the strategies and tactics developed to address the inappropriate confinement of juveniles in juvenile detention facilities and the amelioration of repressive conditions in such facilities. These strategies and tactics are directly applicable to removing children from jails. In this regard, the presentation addressed the following topics:

-- Administrative Placement of a Monitoring Unit

A monitoring unit charged with the responsibility to remove children from jails should be a high-level unit reporting directly to the Commissioner or Director of the responsible agency. This adds credibility to the unit and cuts through "red tape." For example, the Juvenile Detention and Monitoring Unit is administratively placed in the Office of the Commissioner, New Jersey Department of Corrections.

-- Developing a Positive Relationship with Program Administrators

In many cases, juvenile detention administrators

or jail wardens are not directly responsible for inappropriate admissions or conditions which result from lack of funding. Because of this, the monitoring unit should be able to develop an alliance with administrators to address external problems.

-- Evaluating Programs

A major responsibility of the Juvenile Detention and Monitoring Unit is the evaluation of New Jersey's juvenile detention facilities. Documentation of repressive conditions in certain facilities has been instrumental in significantly reducing the number of juveniles admitted to such facilities.

-- Interviewing Juveniles

Although the evaluation process includes interviewing the director and staff of the facility, we have found that it is essential to interview as many juveniles in residence as possible in order to accurately document the conditions, admission practices, etc.

-- Developing Documentation and Evidence of Violations

Admission logs, daily logs, medication logs, juveniles' folders, incident reports and other documents should be thoroughly checked to document inappropriate admissions or program deficiencies. In cases of inappropriate admissions, court records should be cross-checked to provide further documentation.

-- The Use of "Informants" as a Resource Tool

When interviewing staff, we inform them that their names will never be used in our evaluation reports and that they have nothing to fear if they inform us of violations. Because of the trust we have developed with many staff, on occasion they call us to report any illegal practices or serious program deficiencies.

-- The Use of a "Shocking" Incident to Provide Impetus for Broad Program Changes

In one detention center we evaluated, we found that a number of juveniles were handcuffed and shackled with leg irons. In another county we found that many status offenders slept in the detention facility if the shelter for status offenders had insufficient staff. In each of these facilities, virtually all other program violations were corrected because of the publicity surrounding the "shocking" incidents.

-- Use of the Media

Generally speaking, when negative detention program evaluation reports have been published in local newspapers, we have found the county officials must be receptive to correcting the program deficiencies.

-- Generating Public Support

Working closely with citizen groups, church groups, and advocacy organizations is extremely important in addressing inappropriate admissions to detention or jail and in correcting deficient programs.

6 Public Education

James R. Collier
Office of Public Affairs
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

It is a pleasure to be here--to join with all of you in what is a most worthwhile conference, and of greater importance, a most worthwhile project.

I am pleased also to be able to represent the University of Illinois, which, as you know, is a very active and interested participant in this undertaking. As I hope you also know, the University of Illinois, with its flagship campus at Urbana-Champaign, is one of this country's most prestigious and distinguished research institutions. So it is fitting that it serves as home base, if you will, for providing you and your associates with important and timely research data--data from which flow various forms of technical assistance and other services.

My mission today is to discuss media strategies. I shall discuss them briefly, and hope that time permits a number of questions.

I believe all of you know that public education is fundamental to the process of having juveniles removed from adult jails and lockups. Without public support, our mission has no chance of success.

A very basic, and I hope obvious, means of educating the public is via the mass media--newspapers, magazines, and radio and television. The mass media are well represented at this symposium. For example, we have with us the CBS network news, the Los Angeles Times, local Denver reporters, National Public Radio and other outlets.

It is again obvious that we have a newsworthy story to tell, as evidenced by their attendance, by the interest expressed by many other reporters and news organizations not able to attend, and by countless articles which have appeared on this issue in the past.

How to tell this story--and keep telling it--is our subject today.

Let me approach the subject from two perspectives: nationally and locally. Approaching it from a regional angle is still another consideration.

To be sure, we have an issue--a story--of national proportions. Very simply, a national problem commands national attention. The question becomes: how do we attract or focus national attention on this pressing national problem? The surest way--and many think the only way--is through the mass media. So, the media play a role of critical importance--a most fundamental role.

There are several ways. At the Community Research Forum of the University of Illinois we have been discussing these ways for more than a year. We routinely provide information on the mass media, and Barbara Sewell of the Community Research

Forum and I proposed that the Advertising Council undertake, or endorse, in our behalf a national advertising campaign focused on the problem or issue.
Let me describe for you our proposal and what has resulted:

1. CRF and U of I Office of Public Affairs contacted the Ad Council in February 1979 and sent a proposal.

2. We completed a questionnaire, and were asked to meet in New York City. A major question: what action could "the person on the street" take in response to the campaign?

3. We developed and provided the Ad Council with a "Citizen's Guide to Action" on removal of juveniles from adult jails.

4. Finally, our proposal was accepted and we received the endorsement of this prestigious national organization.

5. We met with several major advertising firms to explore ideas about the ad campaign.

6. We applied for a $70,000 grant to OJJDP and received the grant earlier this month.

7. We expect the campaign to be under way by late summer.

It is our idea--our hope--that America and its masses will learn a tremendous amount about the problems of juveniles in adult jails through the Ad Council campaign and that individual and collective responses and actions will be prompted, and that the spinoffs--for the media, the public, for you--will be both great and impressive. It can become our awakening call; our national focus.

Before moving on, let me say more about the Ad Council...because you may be called upon to assist us in securing space and time for the ad materials, and because I want there to be no mistake about the importance of this undertaking.

University of Illinois alumnus Bart Cummings, chairman of the executive committee of Compton Advertising and a member of the executive committee of the Ad Council, had this to say:

"This kind of communication is called public service advertising. You might well ask some questions about it. Who plans? Who prepares it? And who pays for all that advertising space and time?

"It's a completely voluntary effort supported entirely by the advertising industry, by the communications industries, and by American business.

"The Ad Council's aim is to make everyone aware of national problems and to encourage voluntary action to help solve these problems.

"It uses the world of advertising to accomplish these aims. The time on the air--and the space in print--that Ad Council campaigns use are all contributed free. Newspapers contribute free space, as do consumer magazines, and the business press. Agricultural newspapers, black publications, college papers, company publications, the labor press, religion newspapers--all contribute free space.

"Messages appear free in transit adversiting... and in the outdoor advertising medium. TV stations and networks, radio stations, contribute free time to carry the campaign.

"Ad Council campaigns are prepared by America's top advertising agencies--for free. The time and talent of their people is volunteered. (Only out-of-pocket costs are charged for.)"

Let me mention a few of the Ad Council's campaigns of note:

-- Smokey the Bear has been telling us for 35 years to be careful--to help prevent forest fires.

-- Help Fight Pollution: Iron Eyes Cody, the crying Indian, you've all seen him.

-- American families have been taking stock in America by buying savings bonds for almost 40 years.

-- Child Abuse Hurts Everybody. Perhaps you've seen that slogan.

-- "Make America Smarter" and "A mind is a terrible thing to waste" for the United Negro College Fund are campaigns done in behalf of higher education.

The Ad Council is just one vehicle, although we think a dominant one, that we must use if we are to tell our story, and to create a better and lasting public understanding of the problem.

What are some other ways? Gathered here in Denver are various national organizations--look, for example, at the 28 groups now focusing their collective efforts under the National Coalition for Jail Reform--powerful public service organizations all. We must now come together with Judith Johnson's umbrella group to map further national media strategies.

The point is to attempt some coordination--some centralization, of a national media effort. We cannot afford, for example, to have 28 separate bodies all trying to achieve the same goal. We must work together. We should be able to report to you at a subsequent meeting the results of our collective thinking--and efforts.

While we should expect some national coverage now, we should work to tie in with the Ad Council-endorsed campaign, which, again, will begin in the fall.

Let me turn my attention now to how you might function at the local level--in your home communities, in your states and regions. After all, it is at your level that the action really is. We use the phrase "national problem." It is that, of course, but first and foremost it is a local problem. Juveniles are not held in federal jails or lockups, but in facilities in your home communities.

Before discussing or giving you some practical how-to-do-it tips, let me urge--and I mean urge--that you consider the following:

-- Be informed on this issue.

-- Know how to define the problem. That may sound too simple, but, believe me, those of us operating on the national level have encountered difficulties. For example, there have been questions we should have had answers to, but didn't.

-- Know the literature.

-- Know how to use this literature, as well as other resources available to us. If you have questions, and need help, call us or call other authoritative sources who have--or will find--the answers.

-- As a starter, visit the displays on the mezzanine level. Take time to pore over the materials in your packet.

-- Secure data at your local level. Nothing will cause you to lose credibility faster than to not have answers to obvious questions.

How does one work with the local media? (For our purposes we can define local as those media outlets in your community or those throughout a whole region or state.)

Let me answer that by listing for you some of the tools available:

-- Prepare news releases.

-- Prepare, as we did for the national press, a background paper--or papers.

-- Be visible--but not a pest--among editors, publishers, station managers and news directors. Meet with them. Serve them. Respond to their requests.

-- Develop a list of story ideas using the very human stories there are to be told.

-- Be prepared to respond to criticism.

-- Ask radio/TV stations for public service time, like spot announcements.

-- Most stations have programs devoted to discussions of community problems and needs. Make sure you get your share of air time. If they don't have such a program encourage them to develop their own 30-minute documentary. Again, you serve as an idea person.

There are numerous other public education vehicles available to you. For example:

-- Organize state events--not pseudo-news events, but events worthy of serious attention.

-- Make speeches before the Rotary and other civic clubs.

-- Seek endorsements, even proclamations.

-- Coordinate your efforts with local police and other law enforcement officers, with local government groups and others.

-- Stage your own symposia.

-- Organize tours.

-- Visit schools.

-- Perhaps a newsletter would be appropriate to serve the information needs of a mailing list you could develop.

-- Posters can be most effective.

You have a story to tell--tell it!

Brandt W. Pryor
Community Research Forum
University of Illinois

You may have wondered exactly what information should be used in a public education campaign to change attitudes and behavior about the practice of jailing juveniles with adults. Should you tell people that most children in jail are not serious offenders? That children in jail are seven times as likely to kill themselves as children in juvenile detention? Or, that children in jail are subjected to psychological, physical and even sexual abuse? Should you use all three statements? If so, which should get the most emphasis?

Described below is a common-sense method for determining exactly what information must be given to people to change their attitudes and behavior in the desired direction. By using this method you can learn--rather than guess--what information will be effective. By using this method, you can avoid wasting your time, energy and money on ineffective public education messages. By using this method you can design an education campaign that can change people's attitudes and behavior, and remove children from jails in your community.

This method is based on fifty years of theoretical and empirical research in social psychology, and was developed by Martin Fishbein at the University of Illinois. Research using his model in the last five years has proven its efficacy in predicting, understanding and changing, attitudes and behavior. I am using this model now to study rural Illinois voters' attitudes toward the practice of jailing juveniles, and toward their performance of certain "child advocacy" behaviors which could end that practice.

Why do people do what they do? Generally, people perform a given behavior because they intend to perform it. People form this intention for two very simple reasons. The first reason is that they think the behavior is a good thing for them to do. The second reason is that they think people--important to them--want them to perform that behavior.

The first component of a behavioral intention is called the "attitude toward the behavior." There are many definitions of the word "attitude," but one of the most concrete refers to attitude as a "shorthand" of total experience--direct or vicarious--with an "object." (This attitude "object" can be a person, place or thing, an institution, set of values, or a behavior; any discriminable part of the universe.) An attitude then is the sum total of what you "know" about an object (whether objectively true or not), and how you feel about what you "know." Generally, five-to-nine beliefs, and the evaluations of those beliefs, are important in forming an attitude.

Let's say, for example, that the people in your community will be voting in two months on a referendum to remove juveniles from jails. People do not have much information about the issue, and

have fairly neutral attitudes towards their voting "yes." You want to change those attitudes in a positive direction. Using this model, you learn that three beliefs are commonly held by the bulk of the population that is neutral. They believe that their voting "yes" will: 1) prevent juveniles from learning criminal behavior from adult inmates, 2) raise their taxes, and 3) keep juvenile delinquents from being hurt by adult inmates. Let's say they hold each of these beliefs with the same strength (each outcome is equally likely), but evaluate them differently. Suppose they have a very positive evaluation of preventing juveniles from learning criminal behavior, a very negative evaluation of raising taxes, and a neutral evaluation of keeping adult inmates from hurting juvenile delinquents. Since these three beliefs have equal strength (likelihood), the highly positive and highly negative evaluations cancel each other. Along with the neutral evaluation of the third belief, the sum of the three beliefs and their evaluations produces a neutral attitude.

To change this attitude in a positive direction you could change the strength of people's beliefs (their perceptions of the likelihood of those outcomes). Or, you could try to change their evaluations of those outcome beliefs. For example, it would probably be very difficult to change people's evaluation of the second belief--raising taxes. But, you could reduce the strength with which people hold that belief--and hence its importance in determining attitude--by showing that long-run costs (for police, social services and unemployment insurance) would be reduced by keeping juveniles away from the pernicious effects of adult jails. To change the neutral evaluation of the third belief, you would have to learn why people evaluate neutrally the idea of keeping juveniles from being hurt by adult inmates. People might think the juveniles are all "tough kids" who deserve what they get, or that the juveniles would not be seriously hurt, or both. To change the evaluation of the belief, from neutral to positive, you could give people information that 1) most juveniles in jail are accused of only minor offenses, and 2) juveniles are beaten and raped in adult jails, and are much more likely to commit suicide in jails than in juvenile detention facilities.

By reducing the strength of the second belief, and changing the evaluation of the third belief, the sum of the three beliefs and their evaluations would form a much more positive attitude. Yet, as mentioned above, people also form intentions to perform behaviors based on their perceptions that people--important to them--want them to perform those behaviors. The model refers to this second component of intention formation as the "subjective norm." It is normative in that it is based on pressures to perform, that are external to the individual. It is subjective in that the "pressures to perform" with which the model deals are those "pressures" perceived by the individual. (They may--or may not--have any basis in objective reality.) Even though people perceive pressure to perform--or not perform--a given behavior, they may not be willing to comply with that perceived pressure.

This normative component of intention then, is based on the normative beliefs (i.e., "My mother thinks I should vote yes") and the willingness to comply with those perceived pressures. Suppose that the people of your community have a relatively high willingness to comply with the desires of those people important to them, yet perceive little or no pressure to vote "yes" in the coming

referendum. To create normative pressure to vote "yes," your education campaign could give information leading people to believe that those important to them wanted them to vote "yes." (Conversely, if the people perceived strong pressure to not vote "yes," you might want to give information which would weaken their motivation to comply.)

To return to the question with which we began this discussion, "What information should be included in the public education campaign?" we have discussed the use of information to change the strength or evaluation of beliefs in order to change the attitudinal component of intention. We have discussed the use of information to change beliefs about normative pressure or the willingness to comply with that pressure. If there is sufficient change in the attitudinal and normative components of intention, there will be a corresponding change in the intention to perform the behavior. Five years of empirical research have proven the efficacy of this model for the understanding and change of human behavior in a variety of settings and circumstances. Given the existence of this scientific tool, there is no longer any reason to guess about the information that should be given the public in an education campaign. By using this tool, you can determine exactly what information will be most effective in bringing about the behaviors you desire of the public.

7 Changing Policy and Practices

Linda Abram
Community Research Forum
University of Illinois

In response to the federal coordination responsibilities legislatively allocated to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the Community Research Forum, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, has conducted a research and field survey project focusing on five federal agencies: the Federal Bureau of Prisons, U.S. Marshals Service, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Bureau of Indian Affairs and National Park Service. The policies and practices of these organizations were evaluated in terms of the deinstitutionalization, separation and monitoring objectives of the JJDP Act. These agencies were chosen because they operate or contract with correctional facilities and exercise a direct impact on the detention of youth in federal custody. The findings from this research indicate that the targeted agencies do process a large volume of juveniles, and that they have regulations and policies governing the handling of youth which are responsive to the goals of the JJDP Act. However, site visits to the facilities and interviews with federal personnel at the central and regional level indicate that youth are not a priority and that the monitoring systems of these agencies neither attempt nor oversee any monitoring for the identification, treatment, or disposition of children in the federal system. Some of the critical resource shortages are partially set forth below according to agency.

The Federal Bureau of Prisons

The FBOP has no juvenile office and no official solely designated in charge of the handling of youth. The FBOP practices for commitment of youth have been investigated by the ACLU National Prison Project, Bureau-commissioned task forces, and Congressional committees. The Bureau responded only with an urgent attempt to "get out of the juvenile business" by placing youth committed under the Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act in state detention facilities under contract. As of September, 1979 there were 131 juveniles remaining in the federal system. They are concentrated in the California Youth Authority System; the Emerson House, a privately owned facility in Denver, Colorado; and the Woodsbend School in Kentucky. Of the 23 youth in the CYA system, only two were residents of or had committed a crime in California. This is indicative of the Bureau's standard practice of refusal to comply with the requirement of the Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act that juveniles be detained or committed in their home communities whenever possible. It is ironic to note that though the deinstitutionalization OJJDP formula grant funds to California have been terminated due to the commingling of children and adults in the CYA system, the FBOP allows current placements to remain there an would presumably continue referrals to CYA it the contract had not been cancelled by the Youth

Authority due to overcrowding in the institutions. Despite the concern of Native American and children's advocacy groups, Congressional committee staff, and the frustration of FBOP's own regional officials the Bureau has failed to channel any effort into the development of alternatives for juveniles committed under the federal statute.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs

The Bureau of Indian Affairs has no officer in charge of youth programs. The Law Enforcement Chief at BIA stated that "youth is not a priority." This attitude is also reflected by the Bureau Division of Social Services which can best be described as assuming a position of benign neglect towards the plight of youth removed from their homes, and processed through tribal court systems. Of the nine reservations visited, there were several examples of innovative programs which were battling bureaucratic apathy as well as traditional tribal opposition, but these progressive achievements appear to be attributable to the dedication of small groups of individuals on the reservations and do not reflect BIA policy.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service

The Immigration laws define a juvenile as 14 or younger. For the purpose of placement in juvenile as opposed to adult facilities, "juvenile" is defined by state law. In Texas, where 17-year olds are adults, 17-year old prisoners are routinely intermingled with adults in INS Service Processing Centers.

For the purpose of statistical compilation, juveniles are included in the same category as women. The Border Patrol sectors and the INS central office have records of all illegal entrants handled by the Service, but these are never statistically broken down. It is, therefore, almost impossible under the current system to determine the number of juveniles in INS custody during a given time.

INS policy directs regional officials to place children with juvenile care facilities. These may be FBOP or U.S. Marshal contract facilities, but since these tend to be expensive juvenile detention centers in areas of heavy alien traffic INS is likely to make arrangements with more informal local settings. There is often no formal agreement with the facility, no standards and, therefore, no accountability by these facilities to INS.

U.S. Marshals

The U.S. Marshals are charged with custody of material witnesses though the chain of custody between USM and INS is often clouded. There is no statistical indication other than in the Southern District of California, of how many juvenile witnesses or dependents of witnesses are detained, or for how long. Field interviews suggest that is is not unusual for such children to be detained for a period of months, often in a secure detention facility where they are commingled with delinquents. The U.S. Marshals do not have statistical breakdowns on the number of juveniles detained in the 835 jails with which they contract.

National Park Service

The National Park Service field office in San Francisco which exercises jurisdiction over exten-

sive beach and park acreage in the Bay area has an informal arrangement with the San Francisco and Marin County juvenile detention centers whereby the NPS police will take a child but the county will assume the expense. There is no reporting, therefore, of the number of juveniles placed in secure detention and no way to assess their length of stay. In 1978, over 1,600 juveniles were charged by the San Francisco National Park Police. Nearly half were for offenses such as "suspicion," "all other offenses" or violation of liquor or traffic laws. There is a serious breach of federal accountability for the disposition of these juveniles.

Mike Kelly
Juvenile Justice Committee
West Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals

The Juvenile Justice Committee was established by statute in 1977. Its legislative mandate is to "visit, inspect and interview residents" of all institutions, facilities and places throughout the State wherein juveniles may be held involuntarily and to make public reports of such reviews. The Committee is made up of five attorneys who serve without compensation, each appointed by one of the five Justices of the West Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals. In December, 1979, in response to a juvenile suicide in a county jail and several shocking incidents related thereto, the Committee received funding from the Supreme Court to hire a staff and begin a thorough investigation of juvenile incarcerations. The Court granted to the Committee the power to bring legal action against any facility which did not comply with the juvenile law.

Since that time, the Committee has inspected and filed reports on 12 county jails, the state's center for the juvenile mentally retarded, and all four of the state's juvenile corrections institutions. Several of the places visited have begun voluntarily compliance attempts or, in the case of county jails, have adopted policies prohibiting the placement of juveniles in the jail, including special juvenile departments of the jails. Legal action is being prepared against those few facilities which have refused to attempt compliance.

Based on its firsthand, unannounced inspections, the Committee is of the opinion that the main reason that juveniles are being incarcerated in county jails is the failure of the circuit court judges to comply with the law. A majority of the children placed in jail are charged with a misdemeanor or a nonviolent felony (e.g., breaking and entering). Under West Virginia law a child may be placed in a jail (and only the juvenile section of the jail) only if charged with the commission of a violent felony.

Additionally, while those few violent offenders are awaiting trial in jail, the secure detention centers are being overcrowded with children arrested for public intoxication, loitering, shoplifting and other nonviolent, petty crimes.

In its four months of <u>active</u> existence, the Committee has begun to cause the reshaping of the entire juvenile justice system in West Virginia. For the most part, it has met with cooperation from local and state officials. The Supreme Court, much to its credit, has stood by the Committee and not succumbed to the isolated occasions when an official has attempted to use political influence to dissuade the Committee from its in-

spections, findings or recommendations.

We are confident that West Virginia will soon become the model state in the area of juvenile law and juvenile corrections.

David E. Vandercoy
National Juvenile Law Center, Inc.
St. Louis, Missouri

Individuals seeking to effect systems reform of the practice of jailing juveniles in adult facilities by use of litigation face the following major impediments. First, children in jail are effectively denied access to courts and counsel. When a child is jailed, the state becomes the child's legal custodian. The state, via local officials, has caused the incarceration to occur and is not likely, to say the least, to advocate on behalf of a child to remove the juvenile from the jail. The actual custodian, the jailer, is also unlikely to seek legal assistance to effect the removal of a juvenile from the jail. The child's parents have often played a role in involving the child in the juvenile justice system and are unlikely to challenge a practice they have set in motion. Further, even if the parents have not played a role in the process, the parents will usually be of a lower socio-economic class, without political clout, and are usually unaware of their legal rights or of the rights of the child. When one sorts through this scenario, it is readily apparent that the system requires children placed in adult jails to protect their own legal rights without assistance. Thus, while literally hundreds of thousands of children are jailed each year, the jailing practice escapes litigative attack because the system requires children placed in jail to protect their own rights. An advocate system is necessary to ensure protection of the rights of such children. Jail challenges should include a claim based on denial of access to courts and counsel and should seek the establishment of a mechanism to insure such protection as part of the relief sought.

The second major problem encountered is the relatively narrow impact of jail suits even if successful. Jails are county entities. It is extremely difficult to fashion a statewide challenge to the practice of jailing children, since such suits usually attack the appropriateness of the conditions of confinement, and these conditions vary from jail to jail. This often means that plaintiffs will not be able to sue multiple county jails in a class action defendant suit, since the varying conditions may defeat the class action requirement of common facts or legal issues. Several possibilities exist which may afford broader relief than a suit against one county jail. First, look for a state defendant. Some states statutorily charge a state agency with the duty to supervise and oversee all county jail operations. Regulations promulgated by such state agencies are usually openly ignored. If such regulations require different treatment for juveniles in jail than adults, e.g., separation from adults, litigation predicated on the violation of the regulations may be pursued against the state agency. A favorable result in such litigation would yield far broader results than

normally available. Likewise, broader results may be available to specific groups of juveniles such as nonoffenders and status offenders, by attacking the practice of jailing as opposed to the conditions of confinement in each county jail. For example, litigation would rely on the principle known as substantive due process. This principle essentially holds that every person is entitled to life, liberty and property pursuant to the Fourteenth Amendment. The government may interfere with these rights for purposes of accomplishing legitimate objectives (for status offenders and nonoffenders, the purpose is to provide rehabilitation or care and custody). Even if the purpose is legitimate, the intervention must fail if the means are counterproductive of the end sought. Clearly, jailing is counterproductive of rehabilitation or care and treatment. Relying upon such rights, litigators can attack the statewide practice of jailing status offenders and nonoffenders without getting bogged down in issues regarding the conditions of confinement in individual jails.

Another factor to be considered in ligitation of children in jails cases relates to the issue of alternatives and cost. Initially, litigators must know where the suit is going with regard to alternatives prior to filing a jail challenge. Further, it is absolutely necessary to attack the intake procedure practiced by county officials. Analysis of such procedures will reveal that most of the juveniles detained in the county jail do not need to be detained anywhere. Many such children have committed no criminal offense or a minor property offense. Forcing defendants to scrutinize the intake procedure will assist litigators in selling the point that a much smaller alternative would suffice to meet local detention needs than would initially appear if based on prior detention numbers. This revelation will also assist the creation of alternatives since smaller alternatives are obviously much less costly than large facilities.

The above touches only a few of the issues involved in jail litigation. Litigators must make decisions regarding: 1) the scope of the challenge (i.e., habeas corpus relief for a single child or a broad challenge focusing on the practice of jailing children with the possibility of benefitting many children; 2) whether the case is to be countywide or whether statewide relief may be possible; 3) the best forum in which to file the suit, i.e., state or federal; 4) the particular circumstances of your client, i.e., status offender, nonoffender or delinquent, since the legal rights of each group vary. Most importantly, the litigator must know where the suit is going with regard to alternatives. No victory can be claimed if the result of the suite is a 100 bed regional detention center.

Lastly, I want to add a general comment regarding the role of litigation. Many lay advocates view litigation as a mechanism which is disruptive of the spirit of cooperation, of working together to solve common problems. Litigation is feared for what many perceive as a tendency to polarize the parties. In assessing the role of litigation, consider two points. First, the present reform movement was born of litigation, In re Gault, 387 U.S. 1 (1967). Second, the practice of jailing juveniles is an ingrained policy which has existed since the creation of the prison system in the early 1800's. One of the purposes of the first juvenile court established in Illinois in 1899 was to remove juveniles from jail. When judged by whether the court accomplished this particular purpose, the juvenile court system must be rated

a failure. Change is only going to occur if forced. Whether the pressure to force change is legislative, administrative or litigative, the central proposition is that the change will not occur unless pressure is exerted. Litigation is a viable alternative to exert that pressure and force change.

Donna Hamparian
Academy for Contemporary Problems

The Academy for Contemporary Problems is conducting a study of juveniles, persons under 18, tried in adult courts. There are five basic ways that juveniles are referred to adult courts.

(1) In 12 states the maximum of juvenile court jurisdiction extends only to 16 or 17. Juveniles in those states, aged 16 or 17, are routinely tried in adult court for any offense.

(2) In all states, except Arkansas, Nebraska, New York and Vermont, juveniles can be referred to adult court after a judicial hearing in juvenile court. The ages and offenses for which juveniles can be judicially waived differ significantly state by state.

(3) In some states, juveniles, through their attorneys, can request to be tried as adults. This procedure takes several forms, sometimes requiring a judicial hearing and sometimes being an automatic process.

(4) In most states, specific offenses are excluded from juvenile court jurisdiction. These offenses range from murder in several states to traffic, boating and alcohol offenses in many states.

(5) In a half dozen states, the prosecutor or prosecutor and juvenile court decide the forum for the case. In Wyoming this process applies to any offense, in Georgia only to capital offenses.

Data have been collected and studied in every county in the United States on the frequency of occurrence and characteristics of those referred. Several states are being studied in-depth to address the effects on the juveniles, the juvenile and criminal justice systems and public safety of such referrals. In addition, policy issues were identified and are being addressed in a separate volume written primarily by outside experts. The data analysis has just begun. We have only looked at data in a few states, but some interesting findings are emerging. The data indicate that over 90 percent of juveniles waived are male; that blacks are disproportionally represented (controlling for population ratios); and the majority of juveniles waived to adult court are charged with robbery and property offenses. For example, in Florida, the offenses that are resulting in judicial waiver from juvenile to adult court are primarily property offenses--burglary, auto theft and larceny. Less than ten percent of those individuals judicially waived are female and the majority of those waived are at least 17 years of age. In Pennsylvania, over a third of those judicially waived were charged with property offenses. Let me emphasize that these preliminary findings are based on data from a few states.

The data volume from all 52 jurisdictions will be published in late Summer.

I would like to spend the remainder of my time talking with you about the 100,000 juveniles arrested in Georgia, Louisiana, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, South Carolina, Texas, New York, Vermont, Connecticut and North Carolina, who because of the maximum age of juvenile court jurisdiction, of 17 for the first eight and 16 for the latter four, are routinely arrested as adults, jailed as adults, tried as adults and sentenced as adults, frequently to jails. How many of the 100,000 spend time in jail before trial or are sentenced to jail after adjudication is not known. Are the 17-year olds in Texas or Michigan so different from the 17-year olds in Ohio that we can permit jail for the former and not for the latter? Is it a consistent national policy on juveniles in jail to allow 16 and 17-year old juveniles to be held in jail in a quarter of the states, but find the states in non-compliance if juveniles are held in jail in the other three-quarters of the states? As I understand the definition being used by the National Coalition for Jail Reform, these 100,000 juveniles and the juveniles referred to adult courts through judicial waiver, concurrent jurisdiction, excluded offenses and request for waiver, would all be defined as juveniles and should not be detained or sentenced to jail.

This needs to be addressed in light of the potential conflict with the definition used by the Department of Justice and the difficulties states would have in complying with this standard.

Linda J. Gallant
Coalition for the Protection of Youth Rights

---

1) A statewide legal advocacy program in a large state presents significantly different issues, solutions and obstacles in each individual community. A statewide legal advocacy program also faces a constant internal battle between representing individual children in individual cases, as opposed to somehow selecting the major case in bringing in impact litigation to suit.

2) The critical importance of community support--a legal advocacy program does nothing, in reality, about the support of community groups who are available to monitor, to pressure, and to advocate for themselves and their children.

3) Legislative advocacy--forcing the legislator to force the judges to follow the laws which you spent three years trying to force the legislature to enact in the beginning--everybody seems to want to pass the buck.

4) What happens to the kids once we get them out of jail--do they go to mental health institutions? Do they go to coercive residential treatment facilities? Do they go to inappropriate foster homes? Do they go to state institutions far from their communities? In general, once we try to get kids out of jail, how much concern must we have with the "alternatives" which are created to replace the jails?

8 Alternatives to Jail

Suzanne Smith
Hennepin County Home Detention Program

The Home Detention Program provides an alternative to secure detention for youth who are awaiting court disposition. The program is intended to be short-term and utilizes paid and volunteer staff to supervise juveniles on an intensive basis when the Juvenile Court approves their release from secure detention. The goals of the program are:

1. To provide the Juvenile Court, the juvenile, the family and the community with an acceptable alternative to secure detention.

2. To maintain juveniles released from secure detention under Home Detention supervision trouble-free in their communities.

3. To decrease the population of the secure detention center.

4. To demonstrate that it is both operationally and economically feasible to supervise youths successfully outside a secure detention facility using volunteer and paid staff.

Referrals for Home Detention release are made by Probation Officers, Social Workers, Attorneys and Community Workers. All referrals are screened by the program staff and youth must be approved by the court prior to release from secure detention. Generally, youth return to their own home for the period of Home Detention, although other alternatives such as relatives, foster homes or shelter facilities may be utilized.

During an interview with the youth, parents and caseworker, a specific behavioral contract (Home Detention Order) will be developed and signed by all parties. Violations of this contract during the period of Home Detention will result in the return of the youth to secure detention. The Home Detention Worker assigned to the case will monitor compliance with the contract through:

1. making a daily face-to-face contact with the youth;
2. making a daily random phone call to the youth;
3. making a daily check on school;
4. completing daily case logs and final summary;
5. consulting with the caseworker;
6. appearing at subsequent court hearings to report on youth's progress.

Hennepin County's Home Detention Program was initiated in 1975 with grant funds from a local foundation and the design for the program was adapted from programs in St. Louis and the State of Florida. As the program research has shown, there have been high rates of success with the Home Detention Program and correspondingly low rates of absconding and/or committing a new offense. Program staff believes that the success of the program rests on the combination of accountability to the terms of the behavioral contract and the intensive supervision. Although the

program is not appropriate for all youths in secure detention, it is an alternative that works for many juveniles without causing unreasonable jeopardy to the community.

Mary P. Martinez
Chief Probation Officer
8th Judicial District Court, New Mexico

In the 8th Judicial District there has been a policy since January, 1957 that children should be diverted from the Juvenile Court process unless a definite need for court intervention is demonstrated. Commitment to either of the two correctional institutions is considered only as a last resort, for the protection of the public, and hopefully for the benefit of the juvenile himself.

The District comprises the three most northeastern counties of New Mexico. The only common denominator for the counties is the great distance between communities. The county seats are about a hundred miles away from each other. Ethnically and culturally they are nearly as far apart!

Whenever possible juveniles were released to responsible parents or guardians on their agreement to appear for preliminary inquiry or intake. The problem was that with distances so great and telephones unavailable, juveniles, often status offenders, were being held in jails.

As early as 1959 an Advisory Committee to the Court was established in Taos County. Out of it a "Jail Committee" developed in the 1960's. Members were selected from all the child serving agencies in the community. Policies regarding holding slowly developed and the community learned that juveniles could be released without danger to the community.

In 1975 a pilot Shelter Care Program was funded by LEAA which enabled us to hire a third JPO on staff, who found and had licensed, foster homes which would accept juveniles who needed "a cooling off period." Success was so great that the State funded us for the second year.

Based on findings of the Shelter Care project and using the mandate of the Children's Code prohibiting the detention of status offenders of CHINS in a secure facility, the Juvenile Holding Facility model was initiated in Taos County in 1976 and in Colfax County in 1977.

This program model has been extremely successful in rural areas where services and resources are limited and the need for short-term shelter care is great. The program provides for 24-hour services to CHINS, status offenders, and alleged delinquents awaiting return to their home or for further disposition. This service is contracted with a community agency or family and this model has been replicated in other areas of the state. Juvenile Probation Officers provide supportive counseling and referral services. The programs are presently being funded jointly to facilitate administration.
Both Taos and Raton have experienced a change in providers. We have learned that the holding of juveniles for short periods works well with pro-

viders using their own homes to shelter juveniles. In interviewing applicants preference was given to persons experienced in providing foster care. Juvenile Probation Officers and Human Services caseworkers provide counseling, diversion or aftercare whenever needed.

Jonas Mata
Community Research Forum
University of Illinois

The presentation was given in two parts. The first discussed a few of the planning tasks which should be undertaken when developing crisis intervention services; the second discussed the development of intake criteria for pretrial residential services. The presentation's purpose was to focus upon: (1) the shortcomings and general start-up requirements of crisis services, and (2) the importance of specific eligibility or placement criteria for pretrial residential and nonresidential programs as a controlling measure used to make appropriate placement decisions.

(1) Crisis Intervention Services

Personal experience and research verify that in nearly 80 percent of the cases studied, crisis services tend to begin and take on an informal "do-gooder" effort, carrying a broad base of enthusiasm to "help" but not to plan a structured and mature program. Also, programs have been implemented with little more need assessment than identifying a sizable number of juveniles and their families. In short, the assumption has been made that if "some" need exists with "some" support, the need must be large enough to warrant the service.

Solutions to each of these problems are easily stated but difficult to employ. But, hopefully, those which I propose to outline will be used as guidelines toward establishing heartier crisis services.

-- In the thinking stages of crisis intervention services, develop a need assessment model specifying the techniques to be used for gathering data, analyzing data, and reporting it. Include a workplan, timetable, and personnel responsibilities under each task.

RESULT: Avoidance of emotional, do-gooder stomping grounds; and the conceptual and operational framework of crisis services are more accurately focused.

-- Develop an information system which is closely tied to the goals of the program and the crisis operation's manual. Such an information system should not only verify the completion of goals, but should also be useful to diagnose the how and why the goal was achieved.

RESULT: Data for funding purposes and future planning and reorientation of services.

-- Develop program forms, written service guidelines, and written and specific eligibility guidelines as clientele services policies.

RESULT: Clarity as to who receives service, the records to be kept on them, and what service they are entitled to.

(A detailed example of each item mentioned under each guideline is available from the presenter.)

2. Intake/Placement Criteria

In the past year, our organization has set out to measure the need for a proposed service based upon two levels of data: 1) social service, law enforcement and juvenile justice data for at least three years to aid in interpreting existing practices, and 2) survey data which estimate need based upon written and specific criteria for placement in a specific program. Together these measures are used to predict the need for residential and non-residential services. Criteria for each service type are developed. In cases where criteria designating who is eligible for a specific service by detailing criteria in regard to who should definitely not be eligible for a service, i.e., who is eligible for crisis service vs. long-term services, emergency foster care vs. shelter care, and emergency shelter care vs. secure detention. To illustrate the level of criteria developed, an example of criteria for pretrial secure detention will be used.

Secure detention criteria are developed to reflect the major purpose of detention, i.e., danger to person or property, risk of flight, and protection of court process. Current offense and legal history information are used to determine eligibility. The exact wording of criteria changes from state to state, but all meet the principle of specificity and thereby limit the discretion most state statutes allow, while retaining the original intent(s) of the law.

The criteria are developed with state statutes, the state criminal offense code, state court procedures or ruling, and national standards for each respective placement type in hand. The development of such criteria occurs most quickly with a committee of two or three people. After initial development, a larger committee of juvenile justice professionals and juvenile court judges reviews and makes recommendations.

EXAMPLE: Criteria for detention in a secure facility.

1) Dangerous to person or property:

   Current offense:
   a) Present offenses are the following type of felony offenses: (list of those considered very dangerous to person and properties);

   Legal History:
   b) Record of (number) adjudicated offenses against person or property during the past (number) years;

2) Risk of flight to protection of court process:

   Legal History:
   a) Records of (number) of willful failures to appear in court;

   b) Adult not willing to sign a written promise to bring juvenile to court hearing;

   c) Record of (number) absences from the home without parental approval for more than 24 hours.

Shirley Goins
Chicago, Illinois

Nonsecure residential programs as a subject or issue is difficult to address. Everyone does not have a similar definition of what nonsecure may mean. There is agreement that there should be alternatives--what should they be is the question. This question encompasses areas of administration, fiscal, and programmatic concerns.

There are examples of systems, such as the nationwide foster care system, that have been far more damaging to youth than they have helped. Anything to be planned must be a temporary condition--a stopgap measure. Permanency for a child should be the goal, not the forgotten objective to be forfeited and replaced by an existence of rootless insecurity.

Even though the problems and issues are complex, a better system is possible. Large bureaucratic systems do not seem to be the answer for providing quality care. There is no cohesive system of care for children. It seems in actuality to be a patchwork of inconsistency, conflicting, competing organizations, laws and procedures, a maze in which children often get lost and are jeopardized both physically and emotionally. Coordination and cooperation, along with a comprehensive planning process must be established.

Beyond this, children need advocates to serve as role models, to be the liaison to the court, family and program when and if appropriate or necessary. Children are afraid of and confused by the system and learn to hate easily if this anxiety is not abated.

Judy Nogg Levin
Foster Parent Recruitment Center
Denver, Colorado

Foster care is one alternative to detention. It should be looked at in conjunction with prevention, diversion, crisis intervention, family counselling, independent living, home detention, and shelter facilities. Several advantages of foster care are: the environment is home-like, it is cost effective, there is a minimum of peer pressure.

The Foster Parent Recruitment Center developed after my personal assessment of needs as gained through my eight years experience as a foster parent of teenagers. I, then, checked the validity of the need for recruitment and support of foster parents within the community--police, courts, other foster parents, social services, detention centers, shelters, youth advocates. In my research, I discovered that 1,500 Denver metro-area youth had been detained inappropriately in 78-79 due to lack of alternatives. During that fiscal year (1978-1979), there were 650 certified foster homes in the metro-area, with perhaps only 15 of those homes for teens. Counties cited a need for 300 more foster homes.

The Center recruits foster parents for teenagers through a continuous, organized media approach utilizing all available free media, including public speaking, newspapers, TV, radio, magazines, bank displays, posters, and brochures. Content is composed of factual information and experiential information. The Center also assists participating counties in the support of foster parents, including (possibly) assistance with orientation, training, implementing a "buddy" system of volun-

teer foster parent crisis support, foster parent groups, among services. The selection and training of foster parents is the mandated responsibility of each county department of social services in Colorado, and we do not participate in the selection at all. However, we do provide technical assistance to counties, if requested, to help with orientation and training.

Although short-term foster homes for teenagers are a priority, it is by no means the only priority to the departments of social services. Children's problems do not always disappear after 30 days, and most participating counties are interested in developing both long-term and short-term foster care for appropriate youth. Each county has its own mechanism to determine that youth appropriate for foster care cannot go home, are no danger to themselves or others, and may be misdemeanants. The Center does not place any children.

I am concerned that unless we deliver good alternatives to jail with adequate community resources, we are condemning the very children we are trying to help to situations for which there can be more abuses, and those abuses will be more decentralized and harder to eradicate with advocacy.

To utilize foster care, one might do well to: begin with whatever resources are already available, involve experienced foster parents, recognize short-term foster care as just one aspect, utilize available information already in existence such as Child Welfare League Training Information and the National Foster Parent Association.

To insure the quality of foster care, I would recommend: statewide minimum requirements for orientation and training complete with suggested materials; utilization of foster parents in juvenile justice planning; neighboring counties pooling resources; outside monitoring and arbitration of complaints of abuses in all types of out-of-home placements, and notification of this resource to parents, foster parents, and youth; and public education concerning foster care.

Richard W. Sammons
Family Advocacy Council
Auburn, Maine

In assessing the present state of children's services in this country, and in looking towards methods of educating citizen's groups that are to serve as advocates for improved services, we must, I feel, be somewhat specific and directive as to what we, the "professional advocates," view as lacking in our present system and what ingredients need to be introduced into future programs to make them more responsive to the needs of so-called disturbed and deviant youngsters and their families. It is far too simplistic, and serves merely to perpetuate empty, liberal, reform rhetoric, to continue to demand either the emptying of institutions or the improvement of institutional living conditions. It is also naive to think that through something called "public education" we will begin to change attitudes within a general populus that is basically reactionary, at best, apathetic. If citizen's groups and professional advocates are to move beyond the "fiery caution and crusading inertia" that characterizes so many 1970's reform movements, these groups must become

actively involved in establishing standards (and if necessary setting up programs themselves) for community programs that serve the most difficult and most disturbed youngsters and families in our system. They must accept, a priori, that theirs is an unpopular movement, that consensus as to its appropriateness is irrelevant (and often an excuse not to do it), and that the personal and professional risk is immense. We must accept that no only do we live in communities that have no desire to interact with the schizophrenic, the delinquent, the autistic, the retarded, et al, but we are also faced with professional service communities that have become extremely comfortable in avoiding those youngsters and families that prove difficult to deal with and who are unresponsive to our exceptional professional insights and interventions.

Public funding continues to support private agency programs that have entrenched within their systems those very ingredients that undermine any serious commitment to serving the truly difficult youngster and family. In order to impact that system, we must first identify those ingredients that restrict change, and being offered (and actively establishing) alternatives that will establish, once and for all, the right of all individuals, regardless of their degree of disturbance, to live the highest quality of life possible in an open community environment that stimulates them to function at their highest capacity, and yet provides protection from those areas in which they have an overwhelming vulnerability. These individuals, that are presently locked up in our training schools, our state hospitals, and our institutions for the retarded are our primary tools for educating the general populus. Until these people are released, and until their input becomes a reality of day-to-day community life, our communities will remain insulated and uneducated.

This is not new information for any of you--you have known this for some time and have acted upon it in a variety of ways both professionally and personally. I merely reiterate it, and provide the attached guidelines, in an attempt to encourage you to use whatever energies and influence you have to begin immediately establishing new alternatives in the community that will not only "advocate for," but will begin to provide "service to" those individuals in our society that are void of alternatives, and thus destined to a life of loneliness and despair.

In the following chart under the heading "Traditional," I have outlined what I feel are the ingredients within programs that make true change impossible. Under the heading "Change Agency," I have offered alternatives to these ingredients that can be utilized in establishing new standards for programs that can begin providing care in the community for individuals that are presently institutionalized or receiving no services whatsoever. I look forward to your feedback regarding some of these suggestions.

Traditional	Change Agency
-- Conditional care--will care for you "if."	-- Unconditional care--will care for, period.
-- Youngster responsible for adapting to program--if unable to adapt, youngster is discharged.	-- Responsibility of program to adapt to needs of youngster--program will reject pieces of behavior, not entire person.
-- Selective intake policies	-- Open intake policy.
-- Homogenous grouping for purposes of utilizing group control devices.	-- Heterogenous grouping to stimulate for normal environment; individualized living arrangement.
-- Emphasis on pathological aspects of child--disability model overdefines dysfunctional aspects of child, and thus serves to insulate staff interactions with child around normal, everyday expectations.	-- Emphasis on child as total human being with same basic needs as any human child. Pathological adaptation put in perspective of total human existence rather than seen as all-pervasive character.
-- Overly controlled environment with regard to stimulus for dealing with normal everyday routines. At same time, a lack of control with regard to seriously stressful inputs--assault, sexual abuse, isolation, etc.	-- Normal environment established that allows child to act out within safe limits. Routines, Limits, and Anchor Points. Kids exposed to normal variables of everyday life--staff available to assist youngsters in making real-life decisions.
-- Family seen as problem--resistance to working with entire family. Inability to allow family to function at whatever level possible and feel good about it. Subtly judgemental with resultant increase in guilt for both youngster and family.	-- Family dealt with--accepted as primary future support system at whatever level they and youngster can tolerate. Nonjudgemental, extended family relationship ideally between staff and family.
-- MBO approach to treatment--artificial expectations regarding length of RX, cost, etc.	-- Serve and support as needed--advocate for ongoing support.
-- Stagnant funding, i.e., all kids funded at same level.	-- Individual programs prescriptions--each child funded individually based on actual itemized costs.
-- Avoid conflict with community--good public relations.	-- Accept reality of program as community change agent and accept the inevitable discomforts that must occur for real change to occur.

9 Secure Detention

Michael J. McMillen
Community Research Forum
University of Illinois

It is often the case that the availability of secure detention bedspace is viewed as a cure-all place for most of the ills which beset the juvenile justice operations of many jurisdictions. "If we only had detention bedspaces," I often hear from local juvenile authorities, "we could do a much better job of handling offenders." While this is probably true to some extent, the proposition completely ignores the fact that almost anything would be better than the practice of placing kids in jails. And besides that, to propose using suitable secure detention facilities as a final goal is to totally disregard the potential for accomplishing something which is of superior benefit, not just better.

What it boils down to is that: people feel safer with doors that can be locked, and it is certainly more expedient and simpler to set a kid down, turn the key, and deal with the problem later (at a more convenient time). However, as with most other goals worth achieving, the easiest way, the way which seems to offer the least line of resistance, is not necessarily the best or most fruitful. Time and effort must be spent in the most efficient and productive manner possible to achieve worthwhile results; and in the case of most juvenile offenders, that time in which effort can be best invested are the critical moments when a young person enters into the justice system.

It is incumbent upon all local authorities who wish to provide the best and most correct services available to youthful offenders to thoroughly analyze all factors which led to a juvenile's referral to the courts. This must be done immediately during his intake into the system so that appropriate courses of action can be determined and acted upon. It is also necessary to perform this function at once so that appropriate confinement is avoided. Secure placement in an appropriate setting is, after all, far more expensive than non-facility alternatives. So even if we eliminate such matters as altruism, illegality based on federal legislation and court cases, and social conscience as the motivating forces behind reducing secure placements, the practical matter of dollars expended remain intact. I am not suggesting the former issues are not important. They should be the decisive considerations as in most cases. It is just that "getting the most bang for the bucks" always seems to be a root issue which must be confronted.

To this end, it is simply not enough to say that this or that juvenile must be confined because he will be a danger to the community, or will flee prosecution if he is not placed securely. How can this be known ahead of time? Does a child's demeanor at intake somehow enable us to predict his future activity? Hardly. Often, the

worst sort of offender, knowing the little byways of the system, behave in the most docile fashion, while the kid picked up on some piddling charge, scared out of his wits, violently overeacts. Placements based on such behavior work at times, but are not reliable predictors. Many juveniles will still be placed inappropriately.

Is the nature of the offense an adequate gauge of a juvenile's willingness to commit new acts or flee prosecution? Generally speaking, no. A first-time offender is not necessarily prone to criminal activity, and supervision outside of a facility will usually be enough to keep the situation under control. Is jailing an appropriate response to a traffic offense? Is a kid who sasses his parents a serious security risk? Must a juvenile running away from a bad situation at home be thrust into the usually far more inhospitable and regimented confines of secure custody, just because it is the easiest way to keep him off the road while parents are contacted? Sadly, this is exactly how such cases are handled in many jurisdictions, though very rarely can the answer to any of these questions be an unqualified "yes." There is always another course of action which could better benefit the child, the community and the system.

The problem, then, is to develop an efficient method for determining at intake just exactly which youths are in absolute need of secure custody. The National Advisory Committee and the American Bar Association have both come up with objective guidelines which might be used to make this determination. And while these specific placement criteria may not be realistically implemented in every jurisdiction due to various experiences, at least one study has demonstrated that, where such criteria are used, it is possible to predict with a fair degree of accuracy which juvenile can safely be handled outside the confines of a secure facility, i.e., with no recurrent offenses or flight. In nearly every community, where such criteria have been applied, the required number of secure bedspaces are reduced substantially. The object, in any event, should be to develop a rigorous set of guidelines based on offense, current legal status, and past history which can be applied in each case to verify the real need for secure placement. It can be stated unequivocally that the use of objective placement criteria, in combination with intensive crisis intervention and counseling services at intake and alternative non-residential services, will drastically diminish the use of and need for secure bedspaces.

Now, once this assertion is accepted, it becomes possible to analyze case records and project actual number of bedspaces which should be developed by each jurisdiction. This should be the second phase of any correctly organized planning process. The first phase is the recognition that problems in the juvenile handling process exist and the decision that something must be done about them. Once this has been accomplished, the second step, needs assessment, is begun. All available information leads to the conclusion that the greatest number of juveniles who come into contact with the courts can be handled without the need for removal from the home setting, or at least without secure facility placement. This is why the greatest concentration of services must be directed toward developing 24-hour intake screening services and appropriate alternatives. Needs assessment will generally indicate that the availability of 24-hour screening, suitable alternatives and the use of objective placement criteria will virtually

eliminate the need for secure bedspace capacity. However, there is a very real difference between virtual elimination and total elimination of the need for secure custody. Sometime, some place, even in the most efficient and progressive systems, secure placement will be required. Still, the idea must be forcefully driven home that any secure bedspaces should be but the tiniest component in a whole continuum of justice-related service capabilities. It should never be the end-all and be-all to which all efforts are directed. The types of alternatives and services which must be the object of concentrated developmental efforts will be better described elsewhere in these proceedings. My point, simply, is that buildings, especially secure facilities, can never offer a complete solution to justice system problems as they are a response to what should be only the smallest portion of an effectively functioning justice system's needs.

So, okay, despite a thorough investigation and consideration of all possible alternatives, which is the third step in the planning process, a need for a specific number of secure bedspaces can be justified. The decision is made to construct a building which will be regional or locally based depending on population distribution and total beds required. Usually, considering staffing and program costs, a secure facility is a fiscally responsible proposition with no fewer than ten beds, and becomes more economically sound at 15 to 20 beds. A single 16-bed facility is a more viable venture than two eight-bed facilities. Individual jurisdictions which can support no more than a few bedspaces must seek to join forces with neighboring jurisdictions with similar needs. Secure facilities should not exceed a 20-bed capacity figure as staffing becomes cumbersome and individualized programming suffers.

Before the first pencil stroke of the building designer is set to paper, it is absolutely essential that a thoroughly considered operational program be developed. A daily schedule for residents, including all potential activities and staffing patterns, must be established. Environmental requirements must also be incorporated in this pre-design package. Descriptions of the uses of the various spaces should also be included.* A building design, you see, can only be as good as the performance requirements which are presented to the designer. Any gaps in the functional/environmental program will in all probability appear as full-scale deficiencies in the final building configuration. A jurisdiction cannot just sit back and relax, once the decision has been made, and tell a designer, "Okay, build us a building." Every care must continue to be taken to ensure the final product fulfills every foreseeable future need in full measure. It is only with continuing input to the designer about every phase of projected facility operations that a building can succeed, and then only by providing staff with every opportunity to conduct a wide range of necessary activities and services.

If I have left the impression that there is a lot of work involved in initiating good, beneficial services in which secure facilities play a small

---

*American Bar Association Standards, National Advisory Committee Standards, American Correctional Association Standards and Residential Environments for the Juvenile Justice System by the Community Research Forum all contain information regarding advanced, state-of-the-art practices related to the design of secure residential environments.

part, that is because this is absolutely true. Smoothly functioning programs do not appear in the juvenile justice structure or on drawing boards overnight via spontaneous generation. But in nearly every instance, with enough effort they can be achieved. The excuses bandied about by local officials for their unwillingness to investigate all options, to concentrate instead on secure detention facilities, become wearisome through repetition. "All these programs will cost too much," is the frequently used rationalization. Yet, the expense involved is certainly less than the cost of secure facility construction and operations, and that expense seems acceptable. "We need new detention facilities because we don't hold a lot of kids who really need it," is another oft-repeated plea. But until someone is able to demonstrate that all those kids who were released went out and terrorized the town, I will remain unconvinced that detention was necessary. No, I think these and other excuses are simply expedient rationales which seek to conceal the fact that, for whatever reason, a well-organized juvenile service-providing capability is considered just not worth the effort or is beyond the capacity of available staff.

As an architect, it would seem I should be in favor of all new construction that can be generated. But even if we completely eliminate the matter of nagging social conscience, it is hard for me to accept design based on limited program planning. Good design is always an effort at problem solving. In the case of juvenile justice services, the best solutions only partly involve an actual structure. Good design also depends on complete knowledge and familiarity with all functional requirements. Without this, and with inadequate planning, buildings end up being little more than expensive white elephants, a burden for their owners and users with little chance for worthwhile accomplishment. This can hardly reflect kindly on the design profession or the court systems which spawned such structures. And it certainly presents no lustrous image for any involved group or individual professing to be concerned with the welfare of our younger citizens.

Michael F. Bigley
Detention Services, New York State Executive Department, Division for Youth

---

There is no doubt that jail placements are not good child care. Jail placement is only defendable when the community requires protection, and there is no alternative available. However, very few jail placements are, in reality, defendable as community protection and secure juvenile detention is a viable, cost-effective alternative.

Secure detention guarantees the community the protection it deserves and once an area has a secure facility, jail placements should be statutorily restricted. Similarly, secure detention should be restricted to Juvenile Delinquents and exclude Status Offenders.

Designing a secure detention system on a statewide basis, several interrelated factors should be considered.

First, as a planning factor, What is the general youth population? Where is it located? What is the juvenile arrest rate? What is the juvenile petition rate? How many jail placements of juve-

niles are currently being made? How long does it take to complete the court process and is that time period statutorily restricted? How long does it take to place a juvenile in the most frequently used treatment facilities? Most important, what alternatives to detention exist in the state/region/etc.

With this information it is possible to predict approximately how many youths will be detained, using the national standard of ten percent of petitions, modified by local practices. These local practices include police and probation diversion programs which would raise or lower the petition rate compared to the youth population. Those agencies' ability to divert youth depends largely on the availability of intervention programs in the community. Similarly the number of youth securely detained will be determined largely by the size and capability of the nonsecure detention system. This concern for alternatives is graphically demonstrated in the statistics which indicate that of the children placed in jail, only ten percent were accused of crimes against persons, with 20 percent accused merely of status offenses.

Once the number of youth to be detained is ascertained, facilities need to be developed. Secure facilities are required to have large internal programs including education, recreation, medical and social service components. For this reason facilities should be at least 15 beds to support the program costs. These facilities should be kept as small as possible, and certainly not larger than 40-50 beds. The facilities should be located near population centers, and assigned regions based on a combination of travel needs and probable use rates.

The number of admissions to a secure facility cannot predict bed space need without some idea of length of stay. In New York the average length of stay in secure detention is 13 days. In some areas within the state the length is as high as 30 days. Simplistically, a 30 bed facility can accommodate 360 admissions if they remain 30 days each, 180 if they stay two months each, and 1,560 if they remain one week. Maximum lengths of stay should be statutorily imposed to protect the child and the system from neglect since detention facilities are not designed to provide treatment.

In areas when low use rates make the region unmanageable, large satellite holdover facilities may also be useful. The secure holdover facility has a maximum length of stay of 48-72 hours and a maximum capacity of three. It should only be permitted in areas at least one and one-half hours driving time from the regular secure detention facility. The only requirements in addition to adequate square footage are the ability to shower, feed and supervise new admissions on a 24-hour a day basis. No program is required because of the short period of time youths are in residence. These facilities need only be staffed when someone is admitted, and therefore the overall cost is very low. The "facility," two sleeping rooms, an open "dayroom" and a bathroom all within a secure perimeter are all that are required, and this space can be located in virtually any type building--preferably already government owned. The staff can be developed from volunteers including police, probation officers, social workers, college students, etc., who can be listed and called as necessary whenever a youth is admitted. Some areas may want to hire one full or part-time person to coordinate the list of volunteers, and staff the facility the first eight hours, but

those types of decisions can only be made from a specific data base.

This combination of institutional and holdover secure facilities* allows every locality to have access to cost effective secure detention on a regional basis and eliminate the major excuse for youths being placed in jails.

An important concern in creating any facility, but especially secure detention facilities is assuring appropriate use. The agency that administers the facility should never be a law enforcement agency. This separation requires that the administering agency have a 24-hour screening and referral capability, but insures a "checks and balances" protection for both the system and the children involved.

SECURE HOLDOVER FACILITIES: APPENDIX A

A secure holdover facility is designed to provide immediate access to secure facilities in areas which cannot support an institutionally sized secure detention facility. The maximum capacity and lengths of stay are limited to such a degree that no program is required, staff works only part-time as needed and the facility can be located in almost any type building. A 48-hour holdover facility mainly serves local police agencies. It provides police with a place to drop off arrested youth pending court appearances. It also permits the court to avoid early morning and late night transportation. Children in court late in the day can be remanded to the holdover overnight and transported to a regular detention facility in the morning. Similarly, children due in court early in the morning could be brought to the holdover from a regional facility the day before.

In New York State, the Division for Youth's Detention Regulations require:

(A) A holdover facility shall be established only when an approved available secure detention facility is located more than one and one-half hours distant from the Family Court under normal travel conditions.

(B) Children shall not be detained in a holdover facility in excess of 48 hours except that a youth may be detained in such facility for up to 72 hours in the case of holidays or court recess.

(C) Capacity of a holdover facility shall not exceed three children.

(D) A holdover facility shall be located in a fire-resistant building, have at least one individual sleeping room, a separate area for recreation, waiting, interviewing or visiting, a bathroom (to include a toilet, sink and shower) with hot and cold running water. Outside communications, such as 24-hour telephone service, shall be available.

(E) Each facility shall provide for dining and make provisions to serve snacks or meals to newly admitted children, and for regular meals.

(F) When a holdover facility is located in an institution caring for other people, detained children shall be kept in separate quarters out of sight and hearing of such other people.

(G) Provision shall be made for 24-hour awake, on-duty supervision when children are detained in a holdover facility. A woman shall be on duty whenever a female child is detained. Personnel shall be drawn from a panel of persons who have

personal characteristics and experience appropriate for work with children who may be disturbed or angry after apprehension for violation of law and removal from home.

(H) Only children of the same sex may sleep in the same room.

(I) There may be no more than two children sleeping in each bedroom.

Such minimal requirements are only possible because of the limited length of stay and capacities. Other Detention Regulations require that sleeping rooms shall contain 80 square feet for single rooms, 60 square feet per child in double rooms and no more than three children per room (180 square feet). We recommend at least two sleeping rooms of at least 80 square feet and 120 square feet. This provides for co-ed separation or other special problems without restricting the three bed capacity.

Food can be provided in a number of ways depending on the expected rate of use. However, with the proliferation of frozen meals, such minimum arrangements as a toaster oven and refrigerator freezer would be acceptable in many instances.

Because of the limited program space required, the facility could be located almost anywhere. For economic reasons, it is preferable to locate in part of a building that has other occupants and is owned by the municipality/county planning to operate the facility. This generally means no increase in expenses to the operating county, assuming central heat and other utilities. The one prohibition should be against locating in a police station or other public safety building. Despite segregated facilities it is difficult to maintain separate admissions procedures, guidelines and regulations when the program is located in the same building as the local adult jail or lockup.

Staffing is an important consideration, from both an economic and programmatic point of view. The staff is only required when a child is detained, and then, usually, for short periods of time. Therefore, rather than hiring full-time staff, part-time hourly workers should be utilized to minimize expenses. In an area of regular use, one full-time person may be required to maintain a list of hourly workers, and provide coverage for the first eight hours while arranging continued coverage when necessary. In areas with less regular use, local professionals (probation officers, caseworkers, etc.) can be called on to coordinate, while the hourly workers could be child care professionals, students, local concerned citizens, etc. The quality of the staff is very important, and they should be chosen with great care. In a small locked facility, the differentiating factor between juvenile detention and a jail is the atmosphere and movement of youth within the facility. Since there is no program per se, the atmosphere is totally dependent on the single individual working with the youth. With inadequate staff the youth(s) would most likely remain in the separated sleeping rooms a large percentage of the time. With concerned well trained staff the youth would be free to move about within the secure perimeter and would only be in the sleeping rooms to sleep and then would not have to be locked in. Hopefully the staff would be oriented toward crisis interventions, counseling, play therapy, etc., and would be able to occupy the detained youth's time as constructively as possible in such minimum space.

There is the real danger that the facility could be abused. Care should be taken to insure that the facility is not a kid's jail, that there are checks and balances on its operation, and that adequate back-up exists so that children do not remain in the programless facility more than the maximum 48-72 hours.

Jerry E. Kopke
Polk County Juvenile Home
Des Moines, Iowa

Efforts to remove children from adult jails and lockups historically have focused on developing alternatives that closely approximate those same jails and lockups. By limiting populations to children, by renaming the facilities, and by promoting varying degrees of educational/recreational/treatment programming, we have satisfied ourselves that the problem has been solved.

Unfortunately, the dangers of juveniles in jails are not alleviated by the development of juvenile jails. The experience of secure juvenile detention had been typified by programs which are underfunded, understaffed, overpopulated, overutilized, and generally subject to a host of crisis situations frequently described as disturbances or riots depending on orientation.

If we are to be successful in removing children from jail, a number of contingencies must be established and maintained:

I. Availability of Alternatives

Nothing promotes the actual incidence of secure custody as the availability of juvenile detention. Nonsecure alternatives such as in-home supervision, effective probation, foster family care, and shelter care, have been shown to be viable alternatives to secure detention. The presence of a secure detention program can only be justified when a network of nonsecure alternatives is also present and utilized.

II. Identification of Specific Agency Goals

Although the identification of specific goals and objectives for a detention program may appear so obvious as not deserving of mention, there are numerous instances in which the purpose (goal) of the detention program can be described only as "being all things to all people--temporarily." Critical issues requiring specification (and adherence) include: 1) admission/release criteria; 2) service responsibilities for referring agencies; and 3) criteria for program services provided to those detained.

III. Arrangement of Advocacy Contingencies

In order to insure that detention is used appropriately, systems must be established to review the practice of detention. Regardless of the personal qualities of the detention administrator, reliance on good thoughts and trust is insufficient. The development of contingencies that serve to continually review and question detention practices is necessary to insure the limited and appropriate use of secure detention. Examples of contingencies that promote advocacy include:

1) administrative independence from law enforcement, probation, or the court (it is difficult to take a hard stance on admissions when your boss is the one referring); 2) a stable funding mechanism that is not based on per diem (why push to restrict admissions or release quickly if your budget requires a full house); 3) outside review by multiple agencies and citizens' committees; and 4) DON'T DEVELOP TREATMENT PROGRAMS. After adjudication other agencies should be involved. If detention offers not only interim care and diagnostic services but dispositional treatment services many more youth will be detained--and detained longer.

IV. Establishment of Management Information Systems

The existence of internal planning and monitoring systems can greatly affect both the practice and quality of secure detention. The development of a management information system (MIS) should serve to promote accountability by structuring a routine flow of information. Steps to be taken to facilitate an effective MIS system include: 1) development of MBO system for integrated planning; 2) promote a participatory system for program development and review (involve both youth and staff); 3) keep copious records and make decisions on the basis of data rather than opinion; 4) continually evaluate the use of rewards and consequences (perhaps the best indicators of program success); 5) use any and all available expertise--seek out the assistance of universities, consultants, and the literature; 6) disseminate the information obtained.

10 State Strategy Session

The program for the National Symposium on Children in Jails was arranged so that the mornings were used for program sessions to disseminate information on the problem of children housed in adult jails; methods to change public policy to remove them, including advocacy, monitoring and public education; and examples of programs which provide alternatives to jail for juveniles.

During the afternoon sessions, the participants divided into groups by states or regions, examined the problem in their area, and developed plans to remedy the problem.

Since the participants came from 41 states, there was, of course, unequal representation from the different states. Some states had only a few people, many had about ten and Minnesota and Colorado had 20 and 45 respectively at their meetings. Some groups were made up primarily of policy makers, others of practitioners. Because of these varying perspectives, the plans developed by the states/regions obviously varied considerably.

Some state groups agreed to work to form a state jail coalition, others to work at the local level. Some groups are taking specific actions on specific dates, others focused for two days on defining the problem in their area. Some viewed the problem as the serious offender, others felt the major issue in their jurisdiction was the status offender.

A number of concerns or needs for further information came up in group after group. Some of these common issues are: the need for data on the extent of the problem; the need to locate in each community what their alternatives are and to assess the quality of the alternatives; the need to develop a way to transfer funds from one system to another when juveniles are removed from jail and placed in the social services system; a wish that the varying federal agencies that deal with juveniles would use the same definition of what a juvenile is.

Philosophical issues that ran through all the workshops and discussions were: Is the problem juveniles in jails or the inappropriate detention of juveniles? Concern that more juvenile facilities not be built as a result of removing juveniles from jail. The desire to develop alternatives to jail that do not involve more youths being held in detention, or becoming involved in the juvenile justice system. The need to work on the deinstitutionalization of status offenders. How do we deal with the problem of juveniles waived to adult court? We need to face the issue of what care we recommend for violent juveniles.

The conference was a beginning, but only the beginning. A wide variety of people looked at the problem together. They spelled out the problem in their local area, and many of them went on

to tackle the difficult issue of what they would do about it. Following this, are the plans developed by each of the state groups and the contact person for the state, so that others may join those who were at the conference and work together on the problem in their state.

SUMMARY OF STATE STRATEGY SESSIONS

ARKANSAS

Goal

The goal is the removal of children from adult jails. To accomplish this effort we must:

-- Dispel the myths regarding the jailing of children.
   a) develop factual information for statewide distribution;
   b) develop and implement mechanisms for all levels of communities to become involved in attitude changes regarding the jailing of children.

-- Develop a statewide network of alternatives for children.
   a) review existing programs to expand the coordinate services;
   b) develop funding sources for rural areas;
   c) develop "networking" so that rural areas can share existing services.

-- Enact legislation to remove children from jails.
   a) seek legislative definitions and criteria for detention of juveniles;
   b) establish uniform professional court services.

Date of next meeting: mid-April.
Contact person: Faustine Demmings, 501/536-8113.

CANADA (British Columbia)

In Canada,

Each province sets own age limit on juveniles. In British Columbia it is 17.

British Columbia has a population of 2.5 million; 90 juveniles in placement: 30 in two medium/maximum security facilities; 60 in two camp facilities, one of which is co-ed; and has a strong advisory board on which citizens outnumber correctional personnel. There are 30 in two remand (pre-disposition) centers.

In the Juvenile Delinquent Act there is a provision for 14-17 year olds to go into the adult system. This has occurred perhaps five times in the last three years.

Progress:

   a) Strong public service unions which are concerned about quality of care. There is an inspection and standards division in the Province.
   b) The Province has assumed responsibility for police, probation, courts, remand, containment. All personnel except police are appointed.

Contact person: Gordon Mabbett
Phone number: 604/338-5033

COLORADO

The problems as seen by the Colorado group were:

a) children in adult jails;
b) deinstitutionalization of status offenders;
c) inappropriate secure detention (no crime).

The task of the group was to:

a) identify the key actors and groups;
b) develop contacts with the key actors and groups;
c) enlist assistance of the key actors and groups.

A future meeting for the Colorado attendees was set and the goals for the meeting are:

a) addressing the groups' problem statement;
b) identifying key actors;
c) development of strategies;
d) assign task and responsibilities to group members.

Date of next meeting: April 25.
Contact persons: Jim Oleson, Norma Edelman, Lee Steele, Chuck Gavin, Deborah Brincivalli.
Phone number: 303/356-4000 (Lee Steele).

FLORIDA

Goal

Remove children from adult jails.

The Strategy

a) Change attitudes through public education.
b) Change agency policies regarding the movement of children from detention to jail.
c) Increase the availability of legal counsel for children.
d) Improve training for all those involved in the juvenile justice system.
e) Monitor detention practices.
f) Develop enforcement mechanisms for jails and detention facilities.
g) Develop legislative changes to prevent children in jails.

Date of next meeting: April.
Contact person: Mark Ezell
Phone number: 904/224-9483

ILLINOIS

An in-depth assessment of the dimensions of the problem of children in jails as needed:

a) existing data must be validated;
b) the pool of information on the problem must be enlarged;
c) the data must be gathered by the State Planning Agency.

A public education program is needed utilizing data gathered regarding:

a) dissemination of the data to the judiciary, the legislative, and community-based agencies;
b) community organizations must monitor the system and conduct public workshops on all collected results.

Contact person: Don Jensen
Phone number: 312/263-1901

IOWA

The objective is citizen education on the problem of children in jails.

The target groups are:
a) law enforcement agencies;
b) probation and parole departments;
c) general public.

Specific strategy should be developed for education:
a) education at conferences of law enforcement and probation and parole organizations;
b) public education--flyers and other printed material should be developed and distributed via:
1) churches;
2) public utilities;
3) private business.

Date of next meeting: May 15.
Contact person: Carmen Janssen
Phone number: 515/281-3241

KENTUCKY

Problems

The Kentucky group defined some of the problems in their state. Among these are:
a) attitudes of people toward the problem of juveniles in jail;
b) people power (lack of);
c) over-dependency on state agencies (lack of confidence in what locals can do)
d) lack of information on local level.

Some of the needs identified in the state were for:
a) community organizers;
b) training and public education programs.

Contact person: Terry Lee Andrews
Phone number: 502/564-3251

LOUISIANA

Goals

The Louisiana group spelled out six goals for their state:
1) Provide viable alternatives for juveniles waived to criminal court.
2) Enact legislation to remove juveniles from adult jails.
3) Establish a statewide network of alternatives to jails.
4) Dispel the myths around jailing of children.
5) Develop funding sources and alternatives to secure detention.
6) Develop a strategy to involve the Governor in a leadership role.

Date of next meeting: last Tuesday in April.
Contact person: Linda Harris
Telephone number: 504/925-4432

MAINE

Goals:

Reduce the number of children detained in adult jails.

a) Develop a composite profile of the number in detention.
b) Determine which children to adult jails as a result of backup in the state's single juvenile facility.
c) Determine which children go into detention and then into community follow-up programs and why.
d) Adopt procedural and enforcement criteria for detention.
e) Develop a coalition to work on these issues.
f) Establish alternatives to detention, i.e., shelter care and treatment services in the community.
g) Monitor existing services.

Contact person: Mary O'Connell
Phone number: 207/289-3361

MARYLAND

Research is needed in county and city jails and state prisons about:

a) number of juveniles incarcerated;
b) services available;
   1) education,
   2) social services,
   3) psychological services,
   4) job-related services,
c) minority status;
d) offenses of juveniles.

Revise existing legislation and existing alternatives, and review all national surveys about similar problems of waived juveniles.

Develop a public education campaign to include:

a) position papers;
b) slide shows utilizing incarcerated juveniles;
c) develop alliance between Maryland citizen groups and current Maryland state government task force on criminal justice... to reduce juvenile detention;
d) interact education campaign with state juvenile services and existing LEAA grants;
e) involve judges;
f) develop a speakers bureau;
g) develop a mass media plan:
   1) radio,
   2) television,
   3) public service program.

Develop a formal coalition of interested groups.
Develop alternatives:

a) small programs around state;
b) community service as an alternative to incarceration;
c) nonresidential intensive group counseling;
d) intensive community supervision.

Contact person: Bob Harrington
Phone number: 301/388-7255

MASSACHUSETTS

Goals:

a) Eliminate circumvention of present law (i.e., detention in state hospital).
b) Develop capacity for all juveniles within the Massachusetts juvenile system, according to the recommendation of the Task Force on Secure Facilities.

c) Improve the quality of service for juveniles:
   1) finalize and enforce accountability criteria on admissions and on quality of service for both public and private residential and nonresidential care;
   2) develop a monitoring capacity in both DYS and Mental Health.
d) Develop a coalition on this issue around the State Advisory Group.

Contact person: Betsy Pattullo
Phone number: 617/367-2880

MINNESOTA

The goal of the group is to remove children from adult jails and develop alternatives where needed. There are the following problems:

a) lack of data on children in jails;
b) the law allows children to be placed in jail;
c) lack of objective intake criteria in jails;
d) dealing with families;
e) transportation;
f) public opinion.

Action objectives are:

a) change the law;
b) develop alternatives
c) emergency foster homes;
d) transfer to nearby juvenile centers;
e) spend money to accomplish;
f) recreate the children while in jail. Use money as a bargaining tool.
g) monitoring.

To implement these objectives, a state jail coalition is needed. A Minnesota jail coalition will be developed to work on these issues.

Next meeting date: April 29.
Contact person: Rosemary Ahmann
Phone number: 507/285-8115

MISSISSIPPI

Goals

Remove children from jails by 1985.

a) Educate public, legislators and public officials on the problem as it exists.
b) Analyze current problem of existing or nonexistent alternatives and make this data part of educational campaign.
c) Establish statewide network of alternatives.

Strategy Statement

a) Gather complete data on number of juveniles in jails, impact, characteristics and alternatives.
b) Identify target individuals and groups that could effectively disseminate information. Thoroughly explain information and how it can be disturbed.
c) Support and build a coalition.
   1) Using coalition, develop plan for alternatives.
   2) Enact standards, legislation, enforcement, funding.
   3) Develop and implement a model program.

Next meeting date: April 16
Contact person: Herbert Terry
Phone number: 601/354-4111

NEW JERSEY

Goals

a) Decrease number of children in secure detention (30-40 percent could be removed immediately).
b) Change state Supreme Court administrative rules to give judges a placement option for:
   1) those who are waived to adult court--presently ages 14-17;
   2) those now transferred at age 18 to adult court;
   3) develop alternatives;
   4) increase quality of care.

Strategy Statements

a) Develop composite profile of those now in juvenile secure detention.
b) Adopt tighter detention criteria with more objective language.
c) Convince judges to place delinquents to shelters.
d) Establish pilot models for home detention.
e) Strengthen enforcement powers of existing standards is currently available.

Contact person: Joe DeJames
Phone number: 609/984-6539

NEW YORK

Goals

1) Effect statutory change for 16 and 17 year olds now in adult system.

Strategy: Develop the data base demographics needed (in 1976 there were 150 kids in one upstate city lockup).

2) Reduce the number in secure detention in juvenile facilities.

Strategies

a) Develop specific detention criteria which specifies measurement of likelihood to appear, petition processes, jurisdiction, etc.
b) Expand the DFY/DOCS Task Force exploring present and needed options for placement in juvenile detention where space is available.
c) Increase alternatives across the continuum except in secure detention.
d) Put out request for proposals for innovative programs for older adolescents (14-18 age group). Funding can be accomplished under present arrangements such as per diem.

3) Upgrade quality of care beyond minimum standards strategy: provide technical assistance, training, informal enforcement techniques.

4) Building a statewide strategy on this issue using existing coalition and planning boards.

Contact persons: Michael F. Bigley (518/473-4630), Ronald Johnson (212/374-2148), Virginia Mackey (716/232-6446)

NORTH DAKOTA

Goal

Remove status offenders from jails and lockups.

Strategy

Develop a mandate from the Juvenile Supervisors Association to send a delegate to the advisory committee for the Social Service board. Request resource development as an alternative.

Contact person: Rod O'Connor
Phone number: 202/783-5113

SOUTH CAROLINA

Problems

1) Lack of viable alternatives to detention.

2) Wrong intake decision maker for detention.

3) Lack of effective state agencies dealing with children.

4) Lack of criteria for detention.

5) Lack of public awareness as to classification of status offenders.

6) Lack of community support for alternatives to incarceration.

Needs

1) Develop and distribute statewide alternatives to detention.

2) Legislation to set up independent intake officers to make detention decisions.

3) Adequate funding.

4) Develop guidelines (uniform) for detention.

5) Statewide public education system.

Obstacles

1) Poor communication system--see #3.

2) Present Legislative set-up.

3) Desire of workers to "get the job done"--lack of empathy.

4) Poor training; education as to needs of children.

5) Apathy on part of public.

6) Poor education system and no established public education program.

7) Funding and poor use of existing resources.

Contact person: Donny Barker
Phone number: 803/524-6411

VERMONT

Vermont has strict criteria for placement of juveniles in secure detention. This is a well-known program and the average stay in under three days. The state has a wide range of placement options for juveniles, and they are rapidly moved out of secure detention and into less restrictive placements where appropriate.

The problem in Vermont, and our target, is the juveniles serving time in the 22 state jails. There are several possible approaches to the problem:

1) The corrections department could separate those under 18 from the adults or place them in other secure facilities. This does not seem to be a likely possibility.

2) The law could be changed so that mixing juveniles and adults is prohibited by law. Bill H301 has passed the House and is in the Senate Judiciary Committee. We will continue to push for this bill.

3) The state advisory group will serve as the organizer of a support group for this issue.

Contact persons: Gloria Gill (802/863-2540), Diane Mott (802/775-3346), Jack Pransky (802/828-2351).

VIRGINIA

Virginia has a variety of problems in removing juveniles from adult jails. Many jurisdictions do not have sufficient alternatives to jail for pretrial and convicted juvenile offenders. Some jurisdictions do not have adequate transportation to alternative facilities even if they are available. The Code of Virginia allows for the jailing of juveniles. The attitude of many juvenile justice professionals supports the selective jailing of youths. The sanctions for illegally jailing youth have not been used. Improving the inspection of local jails and jail operating standards will also need to be done.

Goal

Remove juveniles from adult jails.
- a) Develop alternative placements.
- b) A need assessment (statewide) is needed which would analyze:
  1) community public relations;
  2) program development;
  3) funding sources;
  4) transportation.

Public education and training for people in the juvenile justice system is needed.

Administrative procedures and policies should be analyzed and appropriate changes should be recommended to communities, agencies, and to the legislature.

A statewide coalition is strongly needed to effect positive change on the problem of juveniles in adult jails.

Next meeting date: April 28.
Contact person: Ron Collier
Phone number: 804/281-9276

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Goals

1) Decrease the number of juveniles in secure detention. Strategies:
   - a) Develop a client tracking system which includes those referred to mental health services and/or facilities.
   - b) Evaluate detention criteria both in statute and in administrative guidelines.

c) Compile data on out-of-District placements.
d) Develop pre-adjudication community-based alternatives.

2) Change statutory and administrative guidelines to provide placement options in the juvenile system for the approximately 20 children per year now waived to the adult system.

3) Strengthen enforcement powers and develop standards of care in both public and private agencies.

4) Broaden the D.C. Coalition for Youth to include parents and citizens.

Contact persons: Shirley Wilson (202-727-6554), Lindsay Hayes (202/659-4156)

WISCONSIN

Summary Statement

Increase public understanding about the misuse of jails for juveniles; turn the tide on the reactionary backlash to the revised Children's Code--especially with regard to the jailing of truants; increase legislative education; increase litigation (conditions concerning confinement); and probably work to enact legislation prohibiting jailing of kids.

The Youth Policy and Law Center will hold in-service training involving, among others, the SPA's. They will continue to work on jails and publish information on this issue.

Contact person: Dee Goodman
Phone number: 608-263-5533

NATIVE AMERICANS

The workshop on Native American problems contained about 15 participants and was held on March 25, 1980. A number of issues surfaced from the round-table discussion and many of the participants were able to provide direct information or sources of information to assist some of the other participants in dealing with their specific problems. One interesting highlight of the discussion was the fact that many participants were concerned over the possibility of LEAA not being funded. Apparently LEAA has assisted in the development of a number of innovative programs on the reservations. It was also felt that there is a strong need to develop and fund new programs in the criminal justice area because of the many special problems faced by Native Americans.

It was pointed out that criminal justice problems are not necessarily of a high priority in an environment where individuals must be concerned about their ability to survive. For instance, housing and unemployment are problems of much greater proportions for a Native American community than is inadequate or inappropriate jail conditions. Legally, however, there are many problems faced by American Indians particularly in regards to reservations. There are often jurisdictional problems between the reservation courts and the local court systems. The breaking of laws on or off the reservation would bring the Native Americans either into contact with local courts, reservation courts or federal courts. A Native American sentenced for what would usually be a violation of state law will end up being a violation of federal law and therefore result in that person being placed in a federal facility often hundreds or thousands of miles away from the reservation. This is a particular problem with

youthful offenders. A Minnesota reservation Indian may find himself being placed in a California federal correctional facility.

In addition to the above, problems are even more complex and complicated if the reservation decides to "retrocede" and in essence become an independent nation. This often has the effect of aggravating bad feelings from the surrounding communities (i.e., since those on the reservation do not pay taxes many of the locals feel they should not be able to receive local or federal services). The reservation if it chooses to retrocede ends up having to provide all of its own services such as fire protection, policy protection, social services, medical and mental health services, etc. Sometimes this causes many difficulties. For instance, one reservation in Colorado contracts for its police services from a neighboring white community. There historically had already existed "bad feelings" between the community and the reservation, and the police protection (lack of it or over-zealous reactions) only tend to aggravate this problem. One particular reflection of this is the fact that the police can hold Native American youngsters in their local jail on simply a "hold order" for up to 75 hours. No other kinds of charges need to be filed.

The issues involved with the problems mentioned above are complex and require a great deal more study and attention. In particular, the issues revolving around the use and abuse of jails for Native Americans needs to be more fully explored.

Contact Person: Don Jensen
Phone Number: (312) 263-1901

WHAT CAN AN INDIVIDUAL DO TO REMOVE JUVENILES FROM JAIL?

1) Visit the jail and see who is there.

2) Talk to your judges about where they place juveniles.

3) Talk to your state and federal legislators. Convince them of the need for change.

4) Locate a local citizen's advisory/planning group and join them.

5) Find someone to discuss your ideas with. From this build a network for change.

6) For a citizen's advisory/planning group.

7) Talk to the parents of the kids in jail.

8) Do research--on the number of kids in jail, the offenses, length of time in jail, etc.

9) Look at the intake criteria at the jail.

10) Join a group that is interested in this area--League of Women Voters, etc.

11) Ask your local elected officials to visit the the jail. Ask them what their position on juveniles in jail is.

12) Write letters to the editor of your paper. Write articles or press releases for your paper.

13) Put an article in your church or organization's newsletter.

14) Show films on this issue to community groups.

15) Speak before community/church groups on this issue.

16) Ask the youth services department what their position on this is.

17) Develop an Alston Wilkes or OAR-type program in your area.

18) Make it difficult to take kids to jail. For example, develop forms, procedures, etc., that must be gone through before a juvenile may be processed into jail.

19) Call the resource people from the conference and your facilitators for help and advice.

11 Closing Remarks

Judith Johnson
National Coalition for Jail Reform

"Don't any grownups love kids?" the child asked Parker Evatt.

Clearly not true.

It's been a long time since I've seen such a committed, hard working group of people as you--showing just how many people are determined to prove otherwise. Your dedication shows in the questioning, prodding, challenging you've done--hour after hour. You came here from 41 states and Canada. Colorado, our host state had the largest group--45 people who worked enormously hard at spelling out the problems in their state.

You represent probation officers, elected officials, alternative programs, sheriffs, community organizers, judges, citizen groups and dozens of other organizations. You are an enormously diverse group--which is why, perhaps, your thinking was so creative and productive.

Together we've looked at the problem from many sides--legislation, regulations, judicial, litigation, advocacy, public education, monitoring--and noted that jail is not the only problem.

The overuse of detention is a common thread among you all and as John Buckley said, "The debate should be over the ten percent who are serious offenders and not over the other ninety percent that we detain."

Conferences can be rejuvenating. And there was some of that.

A community activist, "I was burnt out. I came here and got recharged."

A probation officer, "I have renewed faith in the possibility of what can be done."

But this afternoon we go back home and tomorrow we'll be faced again with the same problems we left. Plus, we'll have post-conference letdown. So what will we do next Monday?

Ira Schwartz says, "It's time for change. It is here. It is now."

John Buckley concurs, "Good ideas need not know a political time. What is needed is people who believe."

And I say, the change has begun. You are the difference. And you have taken the first steps.

Only local people lock up kids and only local people can change this. The Community Research Forum, OJJDP, the Jail Coalition--all of us can help--but only you can make the difference.

Another quote,

"This is the first conference where I've been asked to do something."

"It's exciting to be at a product-oriented conference."

This was an action oriented-conference--aimed at discovering what our problems are, what could be done about them and what WOULD be done. As with any meeting, some came for action, some to learn, some to make connections and some to discuss the problem. Many different results came out. There was no right way. Many more actions came out of the conference than I expected.

A jail manager decided to refuse to accept anymore kids in his jail--as of tomorrow. Many set specific dates for the next meeting or the next action, as a way of spurring themselves on and avoiding post-conference letdown.

North Dakota will meet again May 1 with a larger group. On April 25, the Colorado group will meet again to discuss deinstitutionalization of status offenders, juveniles in jail and inappropriate use of secure detention. Virginia, Maryland, and Mississippi have each agreed to meet again on a specific date. Iowans have decided to have a conference before August to educate the law enforcement and probation officers on the problem. Each person in the group also agreed to educate a specific organization about the problem and meet again before July. One person will educate the judges, another the community agencies, and a third the community organizations. A person in another state has decided to talk to his judge about where his county places juveniles. Another person is going to visit the jail, and see what the intake criteria are, and what procedures are used when a juvenile is brought to jail. Another has decided to show films and give talks to community groups on the problem of juveniles in jail. The list of actions is as broad as is the diversity of this group. Some will begin to form coalitions, others educate the public, and others work with the legislature. Some will work within their agencies and others will take a first look at their jail.

I hope you will keep in touch with the Jail Coalition--and through us, with each other. We will send you a summary of all the state action plans as soon as possible and will call you occasionally to see how you are doing, and offer help and support if you need it. Let us know what you need, and we'll see if we can locate it for you. If you would like more of either of these brochures, let me know. Don't hesitate to call the facilitators, planning committee, panelists, and other participants with questions or just to sound off. We must keep our newly formed network alive.

On behalf of all of us, I'd like to thank the Community Research Forum, the planning committee, OJJDP, the panelists, moderators, facilitators, and all of you.

And I'd like to close the conference with a few memories.

John Buckley, "It's never the right time for change."

Barbara Fruchter with papers piled in front of her, "My husband wanted dinner, and I kept serving

up Juvenile Justice."

Tom Colosi, "A coalition is a win/win situation."

Ken Wooden--"Kids don't have lobbyists."

Kay Harris--"We should clone Parker Evatt."

Ginny Mackey--"This work is like an infection. Some have a natural immunity and others become infected. In some it becomes serious. In this group the disease is terminal."

What a delight to work with a group of people who have a terminal case of love for kids and the determination to change things.

You are fantastic people. Keep up your energy level, be supportive of each other, and we'll GET THOSE KIDS OUT OF JAIL.

12 National Coalition for Jail Reform

The National Coalition is made up of 32 national groups that represent interests as diverse as the National Association of Counties, the National Sheriffs' Association, the American Civil Liberties Union, the American Correctional Association, and National Center for State Courts. By pooling the knowledge and experience of its members, this unusual coalition is helping communities find solutions to major jail problems.

These 32 organizations, which are involved with jails, all agree on the problems of jails. The members of the Coalition agree that the first step in reforming the jails is to remove people who do not belong there, such as public inebriates, the mentally ill or retarded, and juveniles. The National Coalition for Jail Reform endorses the goal that no juvenile should be held in an adult jail.

The National Coalition for Jail Reform can:

1. Provide you with our coalition model and experience, if you decide to develop a coalition to work on this issue. We can show you what has worked for us and what have been the pitfalls--and help you avoid the latter.

2. We can help you tap into the local resources of 32 organizations and identify for you sympathetic representatives of these organizations in your area.

3. Through the contacts of 32 national organizations, we can help you locate what help, information, data, or funding sources are available on the national level.

4. We can join with you in calling for action in your state. Because we ARE national, it may help to give you more credibility in your state to quote us or have a joint press conference.

5. Because we are in Washington, D.C., and the Washington representatives of these organizations closely follow congressional actions, we can help you identify sympathetic people in congress who might support your state efforts.

6. Because we have a network across the country, we can help you locate people and programs that could be of assistance. We could tell you of things that have worked elsewhere or why things have failed.

7. We are developing materials on coalition building, a "How to Look at Your Jail" manual and brochures for public education. We have one on "Juveniles in Jail Fact and Fiction" which you may distribute.

8. We represent 32 philosophies, 32 approaches to the problem of jail and who ends up there. We can help you see the problem on the local

level from many points of view.

We care about what you're doing and we offer you our support and help when you get discouraged. And we want to learn from you too and pass your information on to others. Let us know what you are doing and what you need and we will try and locate help for you and pass on what each of you does, to the rest of you. Together we'll learn what works and together we'll build a local network for support and for action.

For further information contact: Judith Johnson, Executive Director, National Coalition for Jail Reform, 1333 New Hampshire Ave, NW, Suite 502, Washington, D.C. 20036 (202/296-8630).

Community Research Forum

The Community Research Forum is a research and technical assistance unit of the University of Illinois which plans and promotes improved human services at the community and the neighborhood level. The Community Research Forum (CRF) provides these services to communities throughout the nation, through grants from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and other state and federal sources.

The CRF professional staff is drawn from law, architecture, social work, urban and rural planning, public administration, communications, sociology and computer science. Through its affiliation with the University, CRF utilizes the vast resources of the academic staff and student body, the numerous library collections, and other highly specialized services available at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

The Community Research Forum has provided technical assistance to over 200 public and private agencies at the state and local levels concerning the removal of juveniles from adult jails and lockups. The approach used by CRF staff focuses on a total system planning process designed to elicit citizen participation, develop a sound data base for analyzing various policy options, and facilitate a flexible network of alternative programs and services to best meet the individual needs of each youth. Statewide planning efforts have been conducted in Oklahoma, Louisiana, Michigan, Utah, and the Virgin Islands.

Significant research activities have been directed to the issues concerning children in jail and include several published documents.

--JUVENILE SUICIDES IN ADULT JAILS AND LOCKUPS
This study analyzes the nationwide incidence of juvenile suicides in county jails, municipal lockups and separate juvenile detention facilities. Telephone and personal interviews were used to identify predictive indicators of suicidal behavior as well as compare the rates of suicide and suicide attempts in each of the three facility types.

--CENSUS OF ADULT JAILS AND LOCKUPS IN THE UNITED STATES
This study involves a review of previous state and federal surveys as well as contact with national associations and state planning agencies concerned with adult jails and lockups. An inventory of facilities has been prepared on a state-by-state basis with pertinant data concerning the detention of juveniles.

--ASSESSING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF NATIONAL STANDARDS DETENTION CRITERIA
This study survey of four jurisdictions to assess the validity of the objective release/

detention criteria recommended by the National Advisory Committee on Standards for the Administration of Juvenile Justice. The goal of the research was to determine the effectiveness of these criteria in protecting the public safety and the court process and minimizing secure pretrial detention.

--COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF JUVENILE CODES
This study systematically examined each of the state juvenile codes to update the research conducted by the National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections in 1974. Particular areas of focus were those areas of the code which deal with deinstitutionalization of status offenders, separation of juveniles and adults, and monitoring of the juvenile justice system.

--NATIONAL STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION
This competition, which involved the participation of students at 25 colleges and universities focused on site selection techniques, renovation options and construction costs for small, open, community-based shelter care programs for 8 to 12 residents. Award-winning designs featuring program and architectural development were presented and displayed at the 1979 National Youth Workers Alliance Conference.

--NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE INTERNSHIP PROGRAM
This program competitively selected law students from across the country to work with state legislative committees in five states. The interns researched the juvenile justice system in each state as it is prescribed by statute, and interviewed state and local officials to identify discrepancies. An ensuing report to the legislative committee focused on these discrepancies and present options for monitoring the various decision points in the system.

--FORUM ON DEINSTITUTIONALIZATION: SELECTED READINGS ON CHILDREN IN JAIL
This document is a compilation of recent research dealing with the issues related to children in adult jails. The publication surveys the issue with articles on litigation, advocacy, and administrative policy.

--NATIONAL DEINSTITUTIONALIZATION RESEARCH PROJECT
This study examined the status of deinstitutionalization in 41 states and selected federal agencies. The study was conducted through an analysis of policy and procedures at all levels of government and on-site surveys of over 7700 juvenile detention and correctional facilities.

A public education campaign is being conducted in conjunction with the Ad Council to enhance public awareness of the plight of children in adult jails and to enlist citizen help in eliminating the practice of jailing juveniles. Significant background research conducted at CRF included an examination of rural opinions and attitudes concerning the jailing of juveniles, along with a National Student Communications Competition in the areas of journalism, radio and television, and the graphic arts. The advertising campaign will be conducted in early 1981 with distribution scheduled to over 6500 media outlets nationwide.

For further information contact: Jim Brown, Director, Community Research Forum, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, 505 East Green Street, Suite 210, Champaign IL 61820, (217/333-0443).

13 Symposium Roster

Registrants

MaryEllen Agolia
Corrections and Criminal Rehabilitation Department
113 Washington Avenue
Santa Fe, NM 87501
505/827-5222, ext. 296

Mary Ahmann
University of Minnesota
515 Second Street SW
Rochester, MN 55901
507/288-9386

Cathy M. Alexander
Project Daybreak
1190 Winchester Parkway
#111
Smyrna, GA 30080
404/432-0671

Nancy Allen
Children's Rights Project
107 N. Pennsylvania, #300
Indianapolis, IN 46204
317/639-4151

Terry Lee Andrews
Department of Justice/EOSS (SPA)
State Office Building Annex
2nd Floor
Frankfort, KY 40601
502/564-3251

Barbara Applegate
1321 Morningside Circle
Savannah, TN 38372
615/925-4326

John Ashley
Department of Mental Health
160 N. Washington
Boston, MA 02114
617/727-9850

Kirby Awagain
Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement
18853 Wooddale Blvd.
Suite 615
Baton Rouge, LA 70806
504/925-4432

Alan Baily
Oregon Legal Services
2328 NW Everett Street
Portland, OR 97210
503/223-7502

Warren Baker
Long Beach Reach/Court Liaison
26 W. Park Street
Long Beach, NY 11561
516/889-2332

Peggy N. Barnard
Chief Juvenile Justice Planner--ALEPA
PO Box 368
Huntsville, AL 35804
205/539-7090

Kimberly L. Barnes
Youth Network Council
1123 W. Washington Blvd.
Chicago, IL 60607
312/226-1200

81118

Roger Baron
59 Madrone
Woodacre, CA 94973

Ted S. Baumberger
Department of Human Services
PO Box 25352
Oklahoma City, OK 73125
405/521-2856

David Beran
Hamilton Co. Administrator's Office
224 Hamilton County Courthouse
Cincinnati, OH 45202
513/632-8227

Leonard Berman
National Center on Institutions and Alternatives
1337 22nd Street NW
Washington, DC 20037
202/659-4156

Dee Bernhard
LEGIS 50--The Center for Legislative Improvement
Criminal Jurisprudence Commission Staff
#115 State Capitol Bldg.
Oklahoma City, OK 73105
405/521-2871

Laurie Birnsteel
Kentucky Juvenile Justice Committee
2800 Riedling Drive
Louisville, KY 40206
502/895-4745

Elizabeth Blackhawk
Winnebago Tribe of Nebraska
Health Department
Winnebago, NB 57401

William Blore
Ward County Juvenile Court
Box 1741
Minot, ND 58701
701/852-2561

Gaston Bouchard
Centre D'Accueil Cartier
306 Blvd. Cartier
Laval, Quebec H7N-2J2
514/382-1060

Cheryl Bowyer
Oklahoma Crime Commission
3033 N. Walnut
Oklahoma City, OK 73105
405/521-2821

Bard Boyd
Atlanta Regional Commission
230 Peacktree Street NW
Suite 200
Atlanta, GA 30303

Deborah Brincivalli
Regions 9 & 10 Criminal Justice Planning
PO Box 2069
Montrose, CO 81401
303/249-8939

Dan Broughton
Department of Human Services, Court Related & Community Services
PO Box 25352
Oklahoma City, OK 73125
405/521-2881

Barbara Brown
Pinal County Juvenile Court
PO Box 1009
Florence, AZ 85232
602/868-5801, ext. 469

Linda Lee Brubaker
Colorado League of Women Voters
1246 W. Mountain
Ft. Collins, CO 80521
303/493-2829

Robert Burton
Vision Quest
PO Box 12906
Tucson, AZ 85732
602/795-2806

Dennis Cahill
Warren County Sheriff's Department
1000 Grove Street
Vicksburg, MS 39180
601/636-1761

Dian Callaghan
Division of Criminal Justice
1313 Sherman Street, Room 419
Denver, CO 80203
303/839-3331

George Camp
Criminal Justice Institute
60 East 42nd Street
New York, NY 10017
212/697-5116

Marian Cerf
3940 E. Timrod, Apt. 222
Tucson, AZ 85711
602/795-8432

Greg Cherneff
Southeast Denver Youth Services
100 Garfield Street
Denver, CO 80206
303/321-2171

Ellen Christner
Youth Alternatives Program
813½ N. 3rd, PO Box 928
Effingham, IL 62401
217/342-2193

Melissa Clark
Department of Correction
304 State Office Building
Nashville, TN 37219
615/741-1067

Ron Collier
Division of Justice and Crime Prevention
8501 Mayland Drive
Richmond, VA 23229
804/281-9276

J. Brooks Cooper
417 Wisdom
Jackson, TN 38301
901/422-1739

Ray Cummings
Hennepin County Court Services
300 S. 6th Street
Room A-506
Minneapolis, MN 55487
612/348-3261

Adrian Curtis
Office of Management and Budget
Executive Office of the President
726 Jackson Place NW
Washington, DC 20503
202/395-4563

James Dahl
Criminal Justice Institute, Inc.
4004 East-West Highway
Chevy Chase, MD 20015
301/656-7340

Michael Dana
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
633 Indiana Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20531

Jerry Darling
Department of the Youth Authority
4241 Williamsbourgh Drive
Sacramento, CA 95823
916/322-2390

Lyn Davis
LEGIS 50--The Center for Legislative Improvement
333 W. Colfax
Denver, CO 80204
303/825-1776

Faustine Demmings
Division of Youth Services
2505 W. 18th
Pine Bluff, AR 71603
501/536-8113

Jerry Dillon
Dillon Psychiatric Hospital
2525 E. 21st
Tulsa, OK 74114
918/747-3448

Michael C. Donovan
Human Services Law Centre
145 N. High STreet
Columbus, OH 43215
614/464-0833

Elisabeth T. Dreyfuss
Street Law in Corrections Program
Cleveland Marshall College of Law
18th & Euclid Ave.
Cleveland, OH 44115
216/687-2352

Norma Edelman
National Council of Jewish Women, and Colorado Commission on Children and Families
662 S. Fulton Street
Denver, CO 80231
303/344-1616

Betsy Edmunds
Juvenile Court Advocacy Program
85 Devonshire Street
Boston, MA 02109
617/367-2880

Nancy Eisenbrandt
539 Inwood Drive
Nashville, TN 37211
615/741-3521

Liz Elmore-Meyers
LEGIS 50—The Center for Legislative Improvement
Committee Joint Staff
Room 334-S, State Capitol
Jefferson City, MO 65101
314/751-4557

Gaston Fairey
Governor's Office
Division of Public Safety
1205 Pendleton Street
Columbia, SC 29201
803/758-8940

Vera L. Faulkner
JJC-Colorado/Colorado PTSA
2501 Beech Court
Golden, CO 80401
303/237-0517

Arthur Fine
Iowa Network of Community Youth Services
800 Walnut Street
405 Shops Building
Des MOines, IA 50309
515/244-0415

David Fisher
Juvenile Supervisor, Juvenile Court
Morton County Courthouse
Mandan, ND 58554
701/663-4228

Ben Flynn
CBS Television Network
51 W. 52nd Street
New York, NY 10019

Robert Francis
Texas Senate
Capitol Building
Austin, TX 78750
512/475-2057

Robert Francis
Texas Senate
Capitol Building
Austin, TX 78750
512/475-2057

Carol Frank
Office of Regional, Provincial & State Child Care Associations
1346 Connecticut Avenue NW
#310
Washington, DC 20036
202/833-2850

Chuck Gavin
Director, Detention Services
Denver, CO

Winston Gifford
Ralston Purina Company
Checkerboard Square
St. Louis, MO 63188
314/982-3234

Gloria Gil
Public Defender
179 S. Winooski Avenue
Burlington, VT 05401
802/863-2540

Argie Gomez
Pinal Co. Juvenile Probation
445½ N. 3rd Street
Coolidge, AZ 85228
602/868-5801

Dee Goodman
Youth Policy and Law Center
30 W. Mifflin
Madison, WI 53703
608/263-5533

Larry Grauberger
Division of Youth Services
Denver, CO

Nancy Gray
City of Fort Collins
PO Box 580
Ft. Collins, CO 80522
303/484-4220, ext. 701

Sandra Ohs Hahn
Washington County Community Corrections
Courthouse
Stillwater, MN 55082
612/439-3220, ext. 150

Arvid Hammers
Illinois Collaboration on Youth
321½ S. 6th Street
Springfield, IL 62708
217/522-2663

Gerald Hanson
Illinois Supreme Court Committee on Criminal Justice Programs
Room 2001--30 N. Michigan Avenue
Chicago, IL 60602
312/793-3858

Milton C. Hanson
Colorado Department of Social Services
1575 Sherman Avenue
Denver, CO 80203
303/839-2731

Sallie W. Harner
Cincinnati/Hamilton County Criminal Justice RPU
26 E. 6th Street, Room 506
Cincinnati, OH 45202
513/621-9304

Harry Harper
Vision Quest
3030 W. 38th Street
Denver, CO
303/455-0513

Robert Harrington
Juvenile Services Admin.
201 W. Preston STreet
Baltimore, MD 21201
301/383-7255

Linda Harris
Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement
1885 Wooddale Blvd., Room 615
Baton Rouge, LA 70806
504/925-4432

Joan Havercroft
Division of Youth Services
1355 N. 4th STreet
Grand Junction, CO 81501
303/242-1521

Lindsay M. Hayes
National Center on Institutions and Alternatives
1337 22nd Street NW
Washington, DC 20037
202/659-4156

Brent Hege
Youth Law Center of Polk County, Inc.
405 Shops Building
Des Moines, IA 50309
515/244-1172

Russell Hogrefe
Juvenile Justice Advisory Council
American Camping Association
19 S. LaSalle
Chicago, IL 60603
312/332-0833

Anne Hornbein
National Council of Jewish Women
255 Dexter Street
Denver, CO 80220
303/322-5798

Floyd Hudgins
PO Box 12127
Columbus, GA 31907

Elizabeth Hannay-Hurlow
Porter, Novelli & Associates
3240 Prospect Street NW
Washington, DC 20007
202/342-7000

D. Jackson
YMCA Center for Youth Alternatives
1414 S. First Street
Louisville, KY 40208
502/637-6480

Carle Jackson
Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement
1885 Wooddale Blvd.
Baton Rouge, LA 70806
504/925-4461

James R. James
National Center for State Courts
1600 Tullie Circle, NE
Suite 119
Atlanta, GA 30329
404/634-3366

Joyce L. Jamison
Women in Community Service
U.S. Department of Labor
Jobs Corps
1961 Stout, 1733 Federal Bldg.
Denver, CO 80294
303/837-5829

Carmen Janssen
Iowa Crime Commission
Lucas State Office Bldg.
Des Moines, IA 50319
515/281-3241

Nancy Jewell
Division of Criminal Justice
1313 Sherman Street
Room 419
Denver, CO 80203
303/839-3331

Roger Johnson
Department of Institutions
Division of Youth Services
4255 S. Knox Court
Denver, CO 80236

Ronald Johnson
National Board of YMCA's
291 Broadway
New York, NY 10007
212/374-2148

Clergue Jones
NCJRS
Box 6000
Rockville, MD 20850
800/424-2856

Lawrence Jones
Camp Halifax
Lingan Street
Box 34
Halifax, MA 02338
617/293-2186

James Joy
ACLU
1711 Penn
Denver, CO 80203
303/861-2258

Stan Kano
H.I.R.E.D., Inc.
1009 Nicollet Mall
Minneapolis, MN 55403
612/348-4967

Joan Keane
722 S. Washington Street
Denver, CO 80209

Paul C. Keller
Utah Council on Criminal Justice and Utah State Juvenile Court, 5th District
47 S. 1st E. Street
Price, UT 84501
801/637-5491

Mary Jo Killian
Washington County Community Corrections
Courthouse
Stillwater, MN 55082
612/439-3220

Jane C. Knapp
Street Law in Corrections Program
Dleveland Marshall College of Law
18th and Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44115

Neil B. Krugman
U.S. House of Representatives
Education & Labor, Subcommittee on Human Resources
2178 Rayburn H.O.B.
Washington, DC 20515
202/225-1850

David Lambert
National Center for Youth Law
3701 Lindell Blvd.
PO Box 14200
St. Louis, MO 63178
314/533-8868

Frank LaRocque
R.R. 1, Box 70
Dunseith, ND 58329

Mike R. Lemaster
Washington County Juvenile Court
County Courts Building
Fayetteville, AR 72701
501/521-8400

James Levin
Foster Parent Recruitment Center
1290 Williams
Denver, CO 80218
303/321-5784

Arthur Lieb
Juvenile Supervisor, Juvenile Court
Box 2806
Fargo, ND 58102
701/232-4451

Michael Lieberman
Larimar County Department of Social Services
Box 2955
Estes Park, CO 80517
303/586-5150

Paula Litt
Illinois Law Enforcement Commission
120 S. Riverside Plaza
Chicago, IL 60606
312/454-1560

William Littlefield
PO Box 833
Brunswick, GA 31520

Shelda Lussier
Redlake
Redlake Courts
Redlake, MN 56671
218/679-3303

Dan Lombardo
LEGIS 50--The Center for Legislative Improvement
Louisiana State Legislature J.J. Project
PO Box 44012, Capitol Sta.
Baton Rouge, LA 70804

Elaine B. Long
National Council of Jewish Women
686 S. Poplar
Denver, CO 80224
303/388-3836

John Maier
Iowa Department of Social Services
5th Floor--Hoover State Office Building
Des Moines, IA 50310
515/281-6097

Jim Marchel
Utah Juvenile Court
339 S. 600 East
Salt Lake, UT 84102
801/533-5254

Anita Marcus
Texas Coalition for Juvenile Justice
2906 Maple Avenue
Suite 204
Dallas, TX 75201
214/651-9084

Ann Marshall
Tutorial Intervention Program
University of Southern Mississippi
Southern Station, Box 5026
Hattiesburg, MS 39401
601/266-7126

David Martinez
North Denver Youth Services, Inc.
2538 W. 32nd Avenue
Denver, CO 80211
303/458-6585

Gordon Mabbett
Ministry of Attorney-General
941 (a) England Avenue
Courtenay, B.C. Canada V9N 2N7
604/338-5033

Orlando L. Martinez
Division of Youth Services
4255 S. Knox Court
Denver, CO 80236
303/789-1822

Marilyn May
Redlake
Redlake Courts
Redlake, MN 56671
218/679-3303

Leslie Medina
URSA Institute
Pier 1½
San Francisco, CA 94619
415/398-2040

Wally Mlyniec
Chairman, Juvenile Justice Advisory Group
Office of Criminal Justice Plans and Analysis
605 G Street NW, 3rd Floor
Washington, DC 20004
202/624-8205

Paul Mones
Legal Services
529 W. Main Street
Clarksburg, WV 26301
304/623-6640

Lonny Morrison
Juvenile Justice Advisory Council
Iowa Crime Commission
Lucas State Office Bldg.
Des Moines, IA 50319
515/832-3068

Richard Moss
National Council on Crime and Delinquency
50 W. Broad Street
Suite 2640
Columbus, OH 43215
614/461-1106

Diane Mott
Department of Social & Rehabilitative Services
12 Merchants Row
Rutland, VT 05701
802/775-3346

Faruq Muhammad
National Prison Project
1346 Connecticut Ave., NW
Suite 1031
Washington, DC 20036
202/331-0500

Corrine Nobles
1010 14th Street W
Billings, MT 59102
406/252-5703

Terry Nobles
E.F. Link & Associates, Architects
PO Box 1313
Billings, MT 59103
406/245-5453

Jerry Novack
Ohio Youth Commission
35 East Gay Street
Columbus, OH 43215

Mary O'Connell
Maine Criminal Justice Planning & Assistance Agency
11 Parkwood Drive
Augusta, ME 04330
207/289-3361

Debbie Ortiz
Juvenile Justice Advisory Council Member
1579 Osceola
Denver, CO 80204
303/861-8811

Roger Paine
Attention Homes
PO Box 907
Boulder, CO 80306
303/447-1206

Charlotte Panter
National Football League Players Association
26 O'Farrell, Suite 906
San Francisco, CA 94108
415/392-4371

Betsy Pattullo
Juvenile Court Advocacy Program
85 Devonshire Street
Boston, MA 02109
617/367-2880

Warren Paul
LEGIS 50--The Center for Legislative Improvement
333 W. Colfax
Denver, CO 80204
303/825-1776

Tony Perea
North Denver Youth Services, Inc.
2538 W. 32nd Ave.
Denver, CO 80211
303/458-6585

Rejean Pinard
Association Des C.S.S. du Quebec
2420 rue Des Patriotes
Laval, Quebec H7L 3V5
514/625-5357

Susan Pixton
Collard, Kuhnhausen, Pixton & Downes Law Firm
10 Exchange Place
Suite 210
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
801/534-1663

Jerome V. Porter
Office of Pueblo County Attorney
10th and Main Streets
Pueblo, CO 81003
303/543-3550, ext. 207

Leonard Potter
White Earth R.B.C.
Box 418
White Earth, MN 56591
218/983-3285

Dick Powell
Division of Youth Services
1320 "C" Brookwood Drive
Little Rock, AR 72202
501/371-2651

Jane Prancan
The Piton Foundation
4 Inverness Court East
Englewood, CO 80112
303/773-3801

Jack Pransky
Vermont Commission on Administration of Justice
149 State Street
Montpelier, VT 05647
802/828-2351

Patricia Puritz
Washington Streetwork Project
701 Maryland Avenue NE
Washington, DC 20002
202/546-1257

Michele Repke
Human Services Generalist Program
University of Minnesota
7934 51st Avenue North
New Hope, MN 55428
612/535-2743

James Rolando
Montana Child & Youth Development Bureau
517 East Front
Butte, MT 59701
406/792-2324

Michael Ross
Juvenile Justice Advisory Council
Iowa Crime Commission
Lucas State Office Bldg.
Des Moines, IA 50319
515/281-3241

Joli Scheidemantel
Lakin State Hospital
Marshall University
1340 4th Avenue, #31
Huntington, WV 25701
304/529-3483

David Schmidt
PO Box 1842
Albuquerque, NM 87103

E.J. Schmidt
Loveland Police Department
410 E. 5th Street
Loveland, CO 80537
303/667-2151

Charles Schnabolk
Peter Rodino Institute of Criminal Justice
Jersey City State College
Jersey City, NJ 07305

Beverly Schulke
North Dakota Combined Law Enforcement Council, Box B
Bismarck, NJ 58505
701/224-2594

John M. Sells
Johnny Gray Jones Youth Shelter
PO Box 6407
Bossier City, LA 71111
318/747-1459

James C. Shepard
Office of Criminal Justice Planning
7171 Bowling Dirve
Suite 210
Sacramento, CA 95823
916/322-5703

Deborah Shore
Washington Streetwork Project
701 Maryland Avenue NE
Washington, DC 20002
202/546-4900

John Sliemers
Southeast Denver Youth Services
100 Garfield Street
Denver, CO 80206
303/321-2771

Lyn Smith
3435 Albion
Denver, CO 80207

Roger W. Smith
Colorado Department of
Institutions
3656 W. Princeton Circle
Denver, CO 80236
303/839-3414

Andre Soucy
C. Accueil Notre-Dame
de Laval
310 boul. Cartier
Laval, Quebec H7N 2J2
514/382-1110

Bonnie Staley
Larimer Weld COG--Criminal
Justice Planning
201 E. 4th Street, Room 201
Loveland, CO 80537
303/667-3288

Lee Steele
Probation Department
Supervisor, Juvenile Probation
9th Avenue & 9th Street
PO Box C
Greeley, CO 80632
303/356-4000, ext. 585

Philip Stenehjem
Juvenile Supervisor,
Juvenile Court
Box 478
Williston, ND 58801
701/572-6373

George Sumner
Redlake
Redlake Courts
Redlake, MN 56671
218/679-3303

Charles W. Swan
U.S. Department of Health,
Education & Welfare
1961 Stout Street
Denver, CO 80294

Mike Tate
Arrowhead Regional Corrections
319 Courthouse
Duluth, MN 55802
218/723-3461

Herbert Terry
Mississippi Criminal Justice
Planning Division
723 N. President Street,
Suite 400
Jackson, MS 39202

Stephen Thornton
Department of Court Services
Olmsted County Courthouse
Rochester, MN 55901
507/285-8164

Joe Tolan
Department of Human Services,
Juvenile Services Division
216 S. 5th Street
Louisville, KY 40202
502/581-6129

Madlyn Tombs
State Department of
Institutions
3656 W. Princeton Circle
Denver, CO 80236
303/839-3414

John Tompkins
Mississippi Department of
Youth Services
PO Box 692
Vicksburg, MS 39180
601/638-8026

Peyton Townes
926 Virginia Circle
Atlanta, GA 30306

Kathleen Trihey
Arrowhead Regional
Corrections
1418 Fern Avenue
Duluth, MN 55805
218/722-7777

June Tuzinski
Hennepin County Juvenile
Court
11110 W. River Road
Champlin, MN 55316
421-1870

Shirley Underwood
401 E. Wautauga Avenue
Johnson City, TN 37601
615/929-2106

Cindie Unger
Midwest Research Institute
425 Volker Blvd.
Kansas City, MO 46110
816/753-7600

George William Van Meter
Division of Youth & Family Services
1 S. Montgomery Street
Trenton, NJ 08619
609/292-0571

Anita Walker
Community Corrections
1911 Viking Drive NW
Rochester, MN 55901
507/288-8230

Wayne Walker
Juvenile Justice Advisory Group c/o MCJPAA
11 Parkwood Drive
Augusta, ME 04330
207/289-3361

Gary Walsky
Family Therapy Institute
Rugby, ND 58368
701/776-5751

Helga Watt
LEGIS 50--The Center for Legislative Improvement
333 W. Colfax
Denver, CO 80204
303/825-1776

Anita S. West
Denver Research Institute
University of Denver
Denver, CO 80208
303/753-3301

Mark Wickley
Division of Youth and Family Services
Chief, Bureau of Research
1 S. Montgomery
Trenton, NJ 08625
609/292-8510

Diane Woodstern
National Moratorium on Prison Construction
1251 2nd Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94122

Julie Wilkie
Box 627
Belcourt, ND 58316

Nancy Willett
General College
(Lino Lakes Center)
1316 Knox Avenue N.
Minneapolis, MN 55411
612/521-3097

Linda Williams
Atlanta Regional Commission
230 Peacktree Street NW
Suite 200
Atlanta, GA 30331
404/656-7706

Kerry Williamson
LEGIS 50--The Center for Legislative Improvement
Louisiana State Legislature
J.J. Project
PO Box 44012, Capitol Station
Baton Rouge, LA 70804
504/342-2453

Shirley Wilson
Office of Criminal Justice Plans and Analysis
421 8th Street NW
Washington, DC 20004
202/727-6554 or 55

Jerry Wolfskill
Missouri Council on Criminal Justice
621 E. Capitol
Jefferson City, MO 65102
314/751-3432

Phil Wooderson
Boone County Juvenile Justice Center
Rt. 9, Box 492A
Columbia, MO 65201
314/443-1543

Cindy Worley
Governor's Office
212 State Capitol
Oklahoma City, OK 73105
405/521-2345

Mamie Yee
Juvenile Justice Legal Advocacy Project
693 Mission Street, 7th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105
415/543-3379

Jean Zimmerman
Clay County Family Court Services
807 N. 11th Street
Box 280
Moorhead, MN 56560
218/233-2781, ext. 346

Moderators

Rosemary Ahmann
County Commissioner
Olmstead County Courthouse
515 2nd Street
Rochester, MN 55901
507/285-8115

Lawrence Borom
National Urban League
1875 York
Denver, CO 80206

Harold E. Bray, Sheriff
Jefferson County Sheriff's Department
Golden, CO 80419
303/279-2571

Grady A. Decell, Director
South Carolina Department of Youth Services
4900 Broad River Road
PO Box 21487
Columbia, SC 29221
803/758-6251

Craig Dobson, Chief
Division of Jail Services
National Institute of Corrections
PO Box 9130
Boulder, CO 80301
303/443-7060

Terrence Donahue
Juvenile Justice Specialist
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
633 Indiana Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20531

Nancy Grey
Council Member
110 Fishback
Ft. Collins, CO 80521
303/482-8858 or 484-4220

Pete Mirelez
County Commissioner
4th and Bridge Streets
Brighton, CO
303/659-2120

James O'Neill
Executive Director
Colorado Sheriff's Assoc.
619 S. Monroe Way
Denver, CO 80209
303/659-2120

G. Nicholas Pijoan
Associate Professor
Department of Public Affairs
100 14th Street
Denver, CO 80202
303/629-2791

Samuel Sublett
Illinois Department of Corrections
PO Box 246
St. Charles, IL 60174
312/584-0750

Dale Tooley
District Attorney
2nd Judicial District
924 W. Colfax
Denver, CO 80204

Anthony Travisono
American Correctional Assoc.
4321 Hartwick Road
Suite L-208
College Park, MD 20741
301/864-1070

David Wood, Attorney
Wood, Herzog and Osborne
First National Bank Bldg.
6th Floor
Ft. Collins, CO 80521
303/484-2928

Speakers

Linda Abram
Research Associate
Community Research Forum
University of Illinois
505 E. Green, Suite 210
Champaign, IL 61820
217/333-0443

Rosemary Ahmann
County Commissioner
Olmstead County Courthouse
515 2nd Street
Rochester, MN 55901
507/285-8115

Thomas Benjamin
State Coordinator
Citizen's Advocacy Network
National Council on Crime and Delinquency
1901 N. Olden Avenue
Suite 3
Trenton, NJ 08618
609/882-7373

Michael Bigley
Director of Detention Services
New York Division for Youth
84 Holland Avenue
Albany, NY 12208
518/473-4630

Jeanne Block
Kentucky Youth Advocates
2024 Woodford Place
Louisville, KY 40205
502/456-2140

James Brown, Director
Community Research Forum
University of Illinois
505 E. Green, Suite 210
Champaign, IL 61820
217/333-0443

John J. Buckley
Middlesex County Sheriff
Superior Courthouse
East Cambridge, MA 02141
617/494-4400

Robert Campbell
County Court Judge
St. Louis County Courthouse
5th Avenue & 1st Street
Duluth, MN 55802
218/723-3491

John Churchville
Program Associate
Criminal Justice Program
American Friends Service Committee
1501 Cherry Street
Philadelphia, PA 19102
215/241-7136

James Collier
Office of Public Affairs
University of Illinois
Davenport House
Champaign, IL 61820
217/333-5010

Thomas Colosi
Vice President, National Affairs
American Arbitration Assoc.
1730 Rhode Island Ave., NW
Suite 309
Washington, DC 20036
202/296-8510

Jan Costello
Youth Law Center
693 Mission Street
7th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105

Joseph DeJames, Director
Juvenile Detention and Monitoring Unit
New Jersey Department of Corrections
PO Box 7387
Whittlesey, NJ 08628

James J. Delaney, Judge
Juvenile and Family Court Division
1931 E. Bridge Street
Brighton, CO 80601
313/659-1161

Erskind DeRamus, Deputy Commissioner
Pennsylvania Bureau of Corrections
PO Box 598
Camp Hill, PA 17011
717/787-7480

Parker Evatt
Executive Director
Alston Wilkes Society
1101 Olympia Avenue
Columbia, SC 29205
803/799-2490

Mark Ezell
Associate Director
Florida Center for Children and Youth
102 S. Calhoun Street
Tallahassee, FL 32301
904/224-9483

Barbara Fruchter
Executive Director
Juvenile Justice Center of Pennsylvania
2100 Locust Street
Philadelpia, PA 19103
215/735-4948

Linda Gallant, Administrator
Coalition for the Protection of Youth Rights
222 Grain Exchange Bldg.
323 4th Avenue S.
Minneapolis, MN 55415
612/332-1441

Shirley Goins
1415 N. Dearborn
Chicago, IL 60610
312/951-6310

Donna Hamparian
Principal Investigator
Major Issues in Juvenile Justice Information and Training
Academy for Contemporary Problems
1501 Neil Avenue
Columbus, OH 43201
614/421-7700

Thomas James, President
New Pride, Inc.
1401 Gilpin Street
Denver, CO 80218
303/320-4631

Donald Jensen
Staff Consultant
John Howard Association
67 E. Madison Street
Chicago, IL 60603
312/263-1901

Judith Johnson
Executive Director
National Coalition for Jail Reform
1333 New Hampshire Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20036
202/296-8630

Michael Kelly, Attorney
Juvenile Justice Committee
West Virginia Supreme Court
E 402 State Capitol
Charleston, WV
304/348-3649

Robert Kihm
Research Associate
Community Research Forum
University of Illinois
505 E. Green, Suite 210
Champaign, IL 61820
217/333-0443

Jerry Kopke, Director
Polk County Detention Center
1548 Hull Avenue
Des Moines, IA 50316

Kujaatele Kweli, Director
Youth Development League
500 E. 62nd Street
New York, NY 10021
212/644-6572

Judy Levin, Director
Foster Parent Recruitment Center
1290 Williams Street
Denver, CO 80217
303/321-5784

Reverend Virginia Mackey
Chairperson
National Interreligious Task Force on Criminal Justice
50 Plymouth Avenue N.
Rochester, NY 14614
716/232-6446

Mary Martinez
Chief Probation Officer
Taos County Probation Department
PO Box 1287
Taos, NM 87571
505/758-3722

Jonas Mata
Research Associate
Community Research Forum
University of Illinois
505 E. Green, Suite 210
Champaign, IL 61820
217/333-0443

Michael McMillen
Research Associate
Community Research Forum
University of Illinois
505 E. Green, Suite 210
Champaign, IL 61820
217/333-0443

Rebeca Mendoza, Staff Attorney
Juvenile Justice Legal Advocacy Project
693 Mission Street, 7th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105
415/543-3379

Jeanette Musengo, Director
Illinois Prisons & Jails Project
John Howard Association
67 E. Madison Avenue
Chicago, IL 60603
312/263-1901

James Oleson
Oleson-Ratliff Research Associates
Suite 3 - Lang Mission
1572 Race Street
Denver, CO 80206
303/629-9417

John Poulin
National Center for the Assessment of Alternatives to Juvenile Justice Processing
The University of Chicago
969 E. 60th Street
Chicago, IL 60637

Brandt Pryor
Research Assistant
Community Research Forum
University of Illinois
505 E. Green, Suite 210
Champaign, IL 61820
217/333-0443

Donald Rademacher
Town & Country Professional Building
97 West Bee Cave Rd., Room 24
Austin, TX 78746
512/327-4352

Richard W. Sammons
Family Advocacy Council
15 Western Prom.
Auburn, ME 04210
207/786-2117

Ira Schwartz
Associate Administrator
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
633 Indiana Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20531
202/724-7772

Suzanne Smith, Director
Hennepin County Home Detention Program
507 Courthouse
350 S. 5th Street
Minneapolis, MN 55415
612/348-6824

Harry Swanger
National Juvenile Law Center
PO Box 14200
St. Louis, MO 63178
314/652-5555

David Vandercoy
Staff Attorney
National Juvenile Law Center
3701 Lindell Blvd.
PO Box 14200
St. Louis, MO 63178
314/652-5555

John Vermilye
Director of Public Safety
Lakewood Police Department
44 Union Boulevard
Lakewood, CO 80228

Robert Wientzen, Chairperson
Ohio State Advisory Group
7208 Royalgreen Drive
Cincinnati, OH 45244
513/562-1100

David D. West
Director of Formula Grants and Technical Assistance
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
633 Indiana Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20531
202/724-7772

Doyle Wood, Juvenile Justice Specialist
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
633 Indiana Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20531
202/724-7775

Kenneth Wooden
National Coalition for Children's Justice
1214 Evergreen Road
Yardley, PA 19067
215/295-4236

Margaret Woods
Director of Technical Assistance and Policy Analysis
Office of Social Justice for Young People
411 Hackensack Avenue
Hackensack, NJ 07601
201/488-0400

Staff and Resource Persons

Rosemary Ahmann
County Commissioner
Olmsted County Courthouse
515 2nd Street
Rochester, MN 55901
507/285-8115

James Brown, Director
Community Research Forum
University of Illinois
505 E. Green, Suite 210
Champaign, IL 61820
217/333-0443

Elizabeth W. Daum
Community Research Forum
University of Illinois
505 E. Green, Suite 210
Champaign, IL 61820
217/333-0443

Gail Funke
Vice President
Institute for Economic and Policy Studies
901 N. Washington Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
703/549-1634

M. Kay Harris, Director
National Capital Office
National Council on Crime and Delinquency
1706 R. Street NW
Washington, DC 20036
202/234-8904

Donald R. Jensen
Coordinator, Staff Consultant
John Howard Association
67 E. Madison Street
Chicago, IL 60603
312/263-1901

Judith Johnson
National Coalition for
Jail Reform
1333 New Hampshire Ave, NW.
Washington, DC 20036
202/296-8630

Rod O'Connor
National Association of
Counties
1735 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20006
202/785-9577

Brandt Pryor
Symposium Coordinator
Community Research Forum
University of Illinois
505 E. Green, Suite 210
Champaign, IL 61820
217/333-0443

Barbara Sewell
Community Research Forum
University of Illinois
505 E. Green, Suite 210
Champaign, IL 61820
217/333-0443

Margaret Woods
National Council on Crime and
Delinquency
411 Hackensack Avenue
Hackensack, NJ 07601
201/488-0400

14 Bibliography

Allison, Richard. Status Offenders and the Juvenile Justice System, An Anthology. Hackensack, New Jersey: NCCD, 1978. Contact NCCD Continental Plaza, 411 Hackensack Avenue, Hackensack, NJ 07601.

American Bar Association. The Youngest Minority: Lawyers in Defense of Children. Chicago, Illinois: ABA Press, 1974.

----------. Survey and Handbook on State Standards and Inspection Legislation for Jails and Juvenile Detention Facilities. Washington D.C.: Commission on Correctional Facilities and Services, 1978.

American Bar Association/Institute of Judicial Administration. Standards for Juvenile Justice: A Survey and Analysis. Cambridge Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1977. Contact Ballinger Publishing Company, 17 Dunston Street, Harvard Square, Cambridge, Mass. 02138.

----------. Standards Relating to Architecture of Facilities. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1977. Contact Ballinger Publishing Company.

----------. Standards Relating to Interim Status: The Release, Control, Detention of Accused Juvenile Offenders Between Arrest and Disposition. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1977. Contact Ballinger Publishing Company.

----------. Standards Relating to Planning for Juvenile Justice. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1977. Contact Ballinger Publishing Company.

----------. Standards Relating to Monitoring. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1977.

Arthur D. Little, Inc. Community Alternatives. Washington, D.C.: OJJDP, 1979.

----------, with Council of State Governments and the Academy for Contemporary Problems. Cost and Service Impacts of Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders in Ten States. Washington, D.C.: OJJDP, 1978.

Aubry, Ernest L. "The Nature, Scope and Significance of Pre-Trial Detention of Juveniles in California," Black Law Journal 1 (1971), pp. 160-165.

Bartollas, C. and S.J. Miller. The Juvenile Offender. Rockleigh, N.J.: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1978.

Bernstein, Avis. National Jail Registry. Champaign, Il.: Community Research Forum, University of Illinois, 1980.

Brown, James, and Doyle Wood. "National Priority: Removing Juveniles from Adult Jails and Lockups." Corrections Today, May, 1979, pp. 29-33.

----------, and Michael J. McMillen. Residential Environments for the Juvenile Justice System: A Deinstitutionalization Perspective. Champaign, Il.: University of Illinois, 1978.

Children's Defense Fund. Children in Adult Jails. Washington, D.C.: Washington Research Project, Inc., 1976. Contact Children's Defense Fund, 1520 New Hampshire Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.

----------. Children Without Homes. Children's Defense Fund, 1979. Contact Children's Defense Fund.

Cohen, Stanley. "New Lights on America's Prisons." Consulting Engineer, October, 1972, pp. 87-120.

Commission on Accreditation for Corrections. Manual of Standards for Juvenile Community Residential Services. Rockville, Maryland: CAC, 1978. Contact Commission on Accreditation for Corrections, 6110 Executive Blvd., Suite 750, Rockville, MD 20852.

----------. Manual of Standards for Juvenile Local Detention Facilities. Rockville, MD.: CAC, 1978. Contact Commission on Accreditation for Corrections.

Community Research Forum. Children in Adult Jails Project. (Brochure) Champaign, Il.: University of Illinois, 1980.

----------. Forum on Deinstitutionalization: Selected Readings on Children in Adult Jails and Lockups. Champaign, Il.: University of Illinois, 1980.

----------. Legislative Monitoring: Case Studies from the National Legislative Internship Program. Champaign, Il.: University of Illinois, 1980.

----------. National Student Design Competition 1979: A Shelter Care Facility. Champaign, IL.: University of Illinois, 1980.

----------. National Student Design Competition 1980: A Juvenile Services Center. Champaign, IL.: University of Illinois, 1980.

----------. National Student Communications Competition: A Catalog of Public Education Materials on Children in Adult Jails. Champaign, IL.: University of Illinois, 1980.

----------. Proceedings from the National Symposium on Children in Adult Jails. Champaign, IL.: University of Illinois, 1980.

----------. Removing Children from Adult Jails: A Guide to Action. Champaign, IL.: University of Illinois, 1980.

Cottle, Thomas J., "Children in Jail." Crime and Delinquency, 25, No. 3 (1979), 318-334. (In NCJRS collection).

----------. Children in Jail--Seven Lessons in American Justice. Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1977. (In NCJRS collection).

Davis, Samuel M. Rights for Juveniles: The Juvenile Justice System. New York, NY: Clark Boardman Company, 1974.

Dykstra, Larry. Cost Analysis of Juvenile Jailing and Detention Alternatives. Champaign, IL: Community Research Forum, University of Illinois, 1980.

Flaherty, Michael G. An Assessment of the Incidence of Juvenile Suicide in Adult Jails, Lockups, and Juvenile Detention Centers: A Preliminary Report. Champaign, IL: Community Research Forum, University of Illinois, 1980.

Florida Center for Children and Youth. Juvenile Injustice: The Jailing of Children in Florida. Tallahassee, FL: FCCY, 1980.

Goffman, Erving. Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates. Garden City, NY: Anchor, 1961.

Guggenheim, Martin. "Paternalism, Prevention, and Punishment: Pretrial Detention of Juveniles." New York University Law Review, 52 (1977); pp. 1064-1092.

Hall, Edward T. The Hidden Dimension. New York: Anchor, 1966.

Hardesty, Sarah. "Halls of Justice: We're Looking for a New Plan." Inland Architect December, 1975, pp. 18-23.

Hearings before the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency. The Detention and Jailing of Juveniles. 93rd Congress, First Session, Washington, D.C.: 1974.

"A Higher Level of Concern: Foley Square Courthouse Annex." Progressive Architecture, July, 1976. pp. 60-65. (Includes a description of the New York Metropolitan Correctional Center.)

Johnston, Norman. The Human Cage: A Brief History of Prison Architecture. New York: Walker and Company, 1973.

Jones, M.L. American Jails. Centennial of Congress on Corrections: Washington, D.C.: 1970.

Juvenile Delinquency Interdepartmental Council. Standards and Goals for Juvenile Justice. Washington, D.C.: Department of Justice, 1974. Contact Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Kashdan, Sandra. "Architecture for Corrections: "Architecture for Corrections: A Slim Chance to Help." AIA Journal, Feb. 1975, pp. 37-39.

Kihm, Robert C. Prohibiting Secure Juvenile Detention: Assessing the Effectiveness of National Standards Detention Criteria. Champaign, IL: Community Research Forum, University of Illinois, 1979.

King, Jane. A Comparative Analysis of Juvenile Codes. Champaign, IL: Community Research Forum, University of Illinois, 1980.

Kramer, John H., and Darrell S. Steffensmeier. "The Differential Detention/Jailing of Juveniles: A Comparison of Detention and Non-Detention Courts." Pepperdine Law Review 5, No. 3, (1978), 795-807.

Levick, M., and A. Palamarchuk. "Preventive Detention of Juveniles: A Constitutional Perspective." 1, PLM, 157, Jan. 1979.

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. Policy Development Seminar on Architecture, Design, and Criminal Justice. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976.

Levin, Mark M., and Rosemary C. Sarri. Juvenile Delinquency: A Comparative Analysis of Legal Codes in the United States. Ann Arbor, Mich.: National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections. 1974. Contact National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109.

Management and Behavioral Science Center, University of Pennsylvania. Planning and Designing for Juvenile Justice. Washington, D.C.: LEAA, 1972. Contact Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

McDiarmid, Marjorie Anne. "Juvenile Pre-Trial Detention." National Legal Aid and Defender Association Briefcase 34 (1977), pp. 77-82.

McKelvey, Blake. American Prisons: A History of Good Intentions. Montclair, N.J.: Patterson Smith, 1977.

McReynolds, K.L. "Designing a Correctional Facility: From Program to Space-By a 'Consultative Process'." Federal Probation 37 (December 1973), pp. 26-34.

Miller, Nory. "The Loop Gets a Stunning Skyscraper Jail." Inland Architect, July, 1975, pp. 7-13.

Morris, Norval. The Future of Imprisonment. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.

Moyer, Fred D. "In Answer to Questions on Correctional Architecture." AIA Journal, June, 1972, pp. 46-48.

----------. "The Intake Service Center Concept." The American County, July, 1973, pp. 10-11.

Nagel, William G. The New Red Barn: A Critical Look at the Modern American Prison. New York: Walker and Company, 1973.

----------. Quest or Question: The Presumption of Innocence and the American Jail. Champaign, IL.: National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture, University of Illinois, 1977.

National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. Corrections. Washington, D.C.: 1973.

National Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice Standards and Goals. Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Washington, D.C.: LEAA, 1977. Contact Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

National Center for Youth Law. Children in Jails: Legal Strategies and Materials. St. Louis, MO: NCYL, St. Louis University, 1978.

National Center on Institutions and Alternatives. Deinstitutionalization of Juvenile Offenders: A Selected Bibliography. Washington, D.C.: N.C.I.A., 1979. Extensive listing of sources on negative effects of institutionalization, movement toward deinstitutionalization, and establishment of community-based alternatives. Contact N.C.I.A., 1337 22nd St., NW, Washington, DC 20037.

----------. The Violent Juvenile Offender: A Selected Bibliography. Washington, DC: N.C.I.A., 1979. Over 250 sources dealing with life style, treatment, and public misconceptions of violent youth. Available for $1 from N.C.I.A.

National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture. Executive Summary of the Illinois Corrections Master Plan. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois, 1977.

----------. Guidelines for the Planning and Design of Regional and Community Correctional Centers for Adults. Champaign: University of Illinois, 1971.

----------. Intake Planning, Monograph E2 in the Guidelines for the Planning and Design of State Court Programs and Facilities. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois, 1977.

----------. Interim Status: A Study of Juvenile Detention and Shelter Care. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois, 1977.

----------. The High Cost of Unconstitutional Jails. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois, 1978.

----------. Jail Standards. Minimum standards for local detention facilities as proposed by the Nebraska State Bar Association. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois, 1977.

----------. Oklahoma Corrections Master Plan. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois, 1975.

----------. Prison and Jail Security. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois, 1973.

----------. Transfer Series: Alternatives to Detention. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois, 1976.

----------. Transfer Series: Florida: Volunteer Crisis Homes. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois, 1976.

----------. Transfer Series: New Bedford, Massachusetts: Proctor, Accent on the Individual. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois, 1976.

----------. Transfer Series: Pendleton, Oregon. Youth Services for Rural Oregon. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois, 1976.

National Coalition for Children's Justice. Inspecting Children's Institutions. Princeton, NJ: NCCJ, 1977.

National Coalition for Jail Reform. Juveniles in Jails: Fact and Fiction. Washington, DC: NCJR, 1979.

National Council of Jewish Women. Justice for Children--Children's Rights: Six Steps to Justice for Children. New York: NCJW, 1975.

National Council on Crime and Delinquency. Standards and Guides for the Detention of Children and Youth. New York: NCCD, 1961.

National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Service. Analytic Rep. No. 4: Juvenile Dispositions: Social and Legal Factors Related to the Processing of Denver Delinquency Cases. Washington, DC: LEAA, (1975), pp. 28-29.

National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Service. Children in Custody. Washington, DC: LEAA, 1979.

National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Service. Children in Custody: Advance Report on the Juvenile Detention and Correction Facility Census of 1972-1973. Washington, DC: LEAA, 1975. Contact Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC. Document number 027-000-00333-18.

----------. Local Jails: A Report Presenting Data for Individual County and City Jails from the 1970 National Jail Census. Washington, DC: LEAA, 1973.

----------. Alternatives to Institutionalization--A Definitive Bibliography. Rockville, MD: NCJRS, 1979.

National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Report of the Advisory Committee to the Administrator on Standards to the Administration of Juvenile Justice Standards on Adjudication. Washington, DC: NIJJDP, 1977.

National Sheriffs' Association. Handbooks. 7 vols. Washington, DC: National Sheriffs' Association, 1974-1975. Handbooks include: Jail Architecture. Inmates' Legal Rights. Jail Programs. Food Service in Jails. Jail Security, Classification and Discipline. Jail Administration. Sanitation in the Jail.

Nejelski, Paul and Judith LaPook. "Monitoring the Juvenile Justice System: How Can You Tell Where You're Going, If You Don't Know Where You Are?" American Criminal Law Review, 12, No. 9 (1974), pp. 9-31.

Newman, Oscar. Defensible Space. New York: McMillan Company, 1972.

Notes on "The Constitutional Controversy of a Juvenile's Right to Bail in Juvenile Pre-adjudicatory Proceedings." 1 Hasting Law Quarterly 215 (1974).

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. "Rationale Utilized in Determining the Level of Separation for Compliance with Section 223a (13) of the JJDP Act." Monitoring Policy and Practices Manual. Washington, DC: OJJDP, 1978.

Oleson, Jay, and George H. Shepard. Intake Screening Guides: Improving Justice for Juveniles. Washington, DC: HEW, 1975. Contact Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402.

Papenfort, Donnell M., and Thomas M. Young. Use of Secure Detention for Juveniles and Alternatives to Its Use. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago, 1977. Contact School of Social Science Administration, University of Chicago, 969 East 60th Street, Chicago, IL 60637.

Pennsylvania Joint Council on the Criminal Justice System. Alternative Programs for Status Offenders and Detained Juveniles. 1976. (Available NCJRS Microfiche).

Pennsylvania Prison Society. The Prison Journal, Spring-Summer, 1971.

Poulin, John E., John L. Levitt, Thomas M. Young, and Donnell M. Pappenfort. Juveniles in Detention Centers and Jails: An Analysis of State Variations During the Mid-1970's. Chicago, IL: National Center for the Assessment of Alternatives to Juvenile Justice Processing, 1980.

President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. Washington, DC: PCLEA, 1967. Contact Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. #040-000-00102-6.

The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. Washington, DC: GPO, 1968.

"Pushing Prisons Aside." Architectural Forum. March 1973, pp. 28-51.

Rector, John. "Children in Custody: our Continuing National Scandal." PLM, 2, No.1 (1979),

Rector, Milton G. PINS cases: An American Scandal. Hackensack, NJ: NCCD, 1974.

Rutherford, Andrew and Osman Bengur. Community-Based Alternatives to Juvenile Incarceration. Washington, DC: National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, 1976. Contact Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402.

Sarri, Rosemary C. Under Lock and Key: Juveniles in Jails and Detention. Ann Arbor, Mich.: National Assessment of Juvenile Correction, 1974. Contact National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109.

Sherizen, Sanford. Bibliography of Imprisonment and Its Alternatives: Selected Current European and North American Sources. Monticello, IL: Council of Planning Librarians, 1975.

Simet, Anne S. "A Constitutional Right to Release or Bail for Juveniles." Capital University Law Review 6, No. 4, (1977), pp. 635-650.

Sommer, Robert. The End of Imprisonment. New York: Oxford University Press, 1976.

Stout, L. and A. Saunders, Jr. "The Protection of Children's Rights: Duties and Responsibilities of the Attorney." PLM 1, No. 87, (1978).

United National Social Defense Research Institute. Prison Architecture. London: The Architectural Press Ltd., 1975.

United States Congress. Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 as Amended Through October 3, 1977. Washington, DC: GPO, 1977. Contact Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on the Judiciary. Prison Construction Plans and Policy. Hearings before the subcommittee on Courts, Civil Liberties, and the Administration of Justice, House of Representatives. Washington, DC: 94 Cong., 1st sess., 1975.

Wayson, Billy L., Gail S. Funke, Sally F. Familton, and Peter B. Meyer. Local Jails. Lexington, MA: Correctional Economics Center, 1977.

Weintraub, Judith F., Symposium on Status Offenders: Manual for Action. New York: National Council of Jewish Women, Inc. 1976. Contact National Council of Jewish Women, 15 East 26th Street, Eighth Floor, New York, NY 10010.

Wonsever, Rachel. "Juvenile Justice: Preventive Detention." Brooklyn Law Review, 43 (1977), pp. 551-559.

Wooden, Kenneth. Weeping in the Playtime of Others. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.

* U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1981 341-233/1801